The George Washington University
WASHINGTON, DC

175TH ANNIVERSARY 1821-1996

THE PRESIDENT

June 12, 1995

To: Professor Joseph Pelzman

Fr: Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

Re: **Faculty Senate Resolutions for 1994-95**

This is the response to the Resolutions adopted by the Senate in the 1994-95 session.

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

SJT/bf

Enclosures

2121 EYE STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, DC 20052 • (202) 994-6500 • FAX (202) 994-0654

**Administration Response to Resolutions from the Faculty Senate**

**19944-95 Term**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Resolution 94/1* | *A Resolution to Provide Voluntary Retirement Opportunities and Incentives to Faculty* |
| **Response:** | **No action required.** |
| *Resolution 94/2* | *A Resolution on Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Recommendations* |
| **Response:** | **Approved by the Board of Trustees as of February 9, 1995 (text attached).** |
| *Resolution 94/3* | *A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force on Retirement Opportunities and Incentives to Faculty (Substitute)* |
| **Response:** | **Acted on by the Administration (see French memo to Gupta, April 25, 1995).** |
| *Resolution 94/4* | *A Resolution on the Strategic Plan for Research* |
| **Response:** | **Received** |
| *Resolution 94/5* | *A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code Relating to Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Recommendations* |
| **Response:** | **Approved by the Board of Trustees as of February 9, 1995 (text attached).** |
| *Resolution 94/6* | *A Resolution to Recommend the Adoption of a Uniform Financial Performance Model* |
| **Response:** | **Acknowledged with reservations. The Administration recognizes the Uniform Financial Performance Model as an informative instrument, but does not receive it as dispositive.** |

*Resolution 94/7* — *A Resolution Reaffirming the Faculty Code Provisions Regarding Conferral of Tenure*

**Response:** **No action required.**

*Resolution 94/8* — *A Resolution Regarding the Proposed Academic Honor Code*

**Response:** **Academic Honor Code adopted by Board of Trustees as University Code of Academic Integrity with implementation set for the opening of the 1996 fall semester (text of Code as adopted by the Board is attached).**

*Resolution 94/9* — *A Resolution on Final Examination* Conflicts

**Response:** **Accepted by the Administration.**

*Resolution 94/10* — *A Resolution on a University-Wide Policy for Non-Smoking*

**Response:** **Accepted effective January 1, 1996, or sooner, depending on the development of an appropriate informational and enforcement plan involving faculty, staff and students. Walter Bortz and Al Ingle to co-chair committee of their designation.**

*Resolution 94/11* — *A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Stefan O. Schiff*

**Response:** **Noted with our concurrence.**

*Resolution 94/12* — *A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Lilien F. Robinson*

**Response:** **Noted with our concurrence.**

*Resolution 94/13* — *A Resolution Regarding a Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research*

**Response:** **Approved by the Board of Trustees under these conditions:**

**Request that the Faculty Senate and Administration draft a University-wide, all-encompassing conflict of interest policy for review by the Academic Affairs Committee in order that the Board might receive it for action at the May 1996 meeting.**

**Approval of this conflict of interest statement will expire at the end of one year and be merged into the University-wide statement to be drafted by the Faculty Senate and Administration.**

175 George Washington University
WASHINGTON, DC
175TH ANNIVERSARY 1821-1996

VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

April 25, 1995

TO: Professor Murli Gupta
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on Development and Support

FROM: Roderick S. French
Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: Joint Task Force

I do regret not being able to respond more expeditiously to the resolution put forward by your committee and adopted by the Faculty Senate last November which called for a joint task force to explore the establishment of a comprehensive scheme of incentive and benefits that might be made available to retiring faculty.

My own "retirement" from my present position makes my participation in this endeavor unhelpful. I have consulted with President Trachtenberg, and we have agreed on the proper composition of the set of administrators to join you and your colleagues in the investigation of this subject.

In light of the way various responsibilities pertinent to this matter are distributed among various administrators, we really need to have four administrative members of the task force. Dr. Linda B. Salamon, as Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, will serve as co-chair with you. The other three members will be Lou Katz, Vice President and Treasurer, Walter Bortz, Vice President for Information and Administrative Services, and Dennis Blumer, the University's new General Counsel. I think you will agree that this combination of persons represents all the appropriate areas of expertise for this task.

cc: Professor Robinson
President Trachtenberg

2121 EYE STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, DC 20052 • (202) 994-6510

A Resolution To Amend the Faculty Code at Section B.4 of the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees took action on February 10, 1994, requesting a revision of the provisions of the Faculty Code for the handling of administrative nonconcurrences with faculty personnel recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate expressed profound reluctance to remove the role of the Board in the resolution of such nonconcurrences; and

WHEREAS, the leadership of this Board authorized the administration to seek a compromise that would retain the option of the present appeal process and concurrently introduce an alternate appeal process to be elected by the pertinent party or parties, and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate has endorsed such an action; now THERFFORE

BE IT RESOLVED By the Board of Trustees,
that Section B.4 of the Faculty Code be amended to add the following language, underlined, at the conclusion of that Section:

". . . shall be transmitted to the Board of Trustees through the President, except that, at its discretion, the originating faculty unit may instead elect to leave the decision to the President."

February 7, 1995

**Resolution to Adopt a University Code of Academic Integrity**

WHEREAS academic life is at the heart of the mission of the University; and

WHEREAS the University has a responsibility to promote academic integrity among its student and faculty communities; and

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate and Student Association have both passed the Code of Academic Integrity;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Code of Academic Integrity is hereby adopted by the Board of Trustees, effective Fall, 1996; and that the interim time shall be used to prepare for the implementation of the Code; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any editorial changes which have been made on the advice of the University's legal counsel shall be communicated to the faculty and student groups which originated the Code of Academic Integrity.

RESOLUTIONS 1994-95 SESSION

| Resolution No. | Meeting | Title of Resolution | Action | Remarks and/or Committee Referral |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 94/1 | 9/9/94 | A Resolution to Provide Voluntary Retirement Opportunities and Incentives to Faculty | Recommitted 9/9/94 | |
| 94/2 | 10/14/94 | A Resolution on Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Recommendations | Adopted, as amended, 10/14/94 | |
| 94/3 | 11/11/94 | A Resolution to Recommend the Establishment of a Joint Faculty-Administration Task Force on Retirement Opportunities and Incentives to Faculty (Substitute) | Adopted, as amended, 11/11/94 | |
| 94/4 | 11/11/94 | A Resolution on the Strategic Plan for Research | Postponed, 11/11/94 | Postponed to December 9, 1994, Senate meeting |
| | 12/9/94 | A Resolution on the Strategic Plan for Research (Substitute) | Adopted 12/9/94 | |
| 94/5 | 1/20/95 | A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code Relating to Administrative Nonconcurrences with Faculty Recommendations | Adopted, as amended, 1/20/95 | Approved by Board of Trustees February 9, 1995 |
| 94/6 | 2/10/95 | A Resolution to Recommend the Adoption of a Uniform Financial Performance Model | Adopted 2/10/95 | |
| 94/7 | 3/10/95 | A Resolution Reaffirming the Faculty Code Provisions Regarding Conferral of Tenure | Withdrawn 3/10/95 | Withdrawn for further study by the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee |

(continued)

RESOLUTIONS 1994-95 SESSION

| Resolution No. | Meeting | Title of Resolution | Action | Remarks and/or Committee Referral |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 94/8 | 3/10/95 | A Resolution Regarding the Proposed Academic Honor Code | Adopted, as amended, 3/10/95 | |
| 94/9 | 3/10/95 | A Resolution on Final Examination Conflicts | Adopted, as amended, 3/10/95 | |
| 94/10 | 4/14/95 | A Resolution on a University-Wide Policy for Non-Smoking | Adopted, as amended, 4/14/95 | |
| 94/11 | 4/14/95 | A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Stefan O. Schiff | Adopted by Acclamation, 4/14/95 | |
| 94/12 | 4/14/95 | A Resolution of Appreciation for Professor Lilien F. Robinson | Adopted by Acclamation, 4/14/95 | |
| 94/13 | 4/28/95 Special Meeting | A Resolution Regarding a Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research | Adopted, as Amended 4/28/95 | |

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Development and Support 4-4857.]

with Report

# A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY (94/1)

WHEREAS, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act precludes any fixed age retirement for the University faculty; and

WHEREAS, it is in the mutual interest of both faculty and the University that faculty members retire before their teaching and research effectiveness becomes compromised; and

WHEREAS, it is important to the academic freedom of all faculty that changes in the U.S. law not result in a weakening of the tenure system; and

WHEREAS, it is important that individual faculty members voluntarily determine when they wish to discontinue their active service at the University; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That all faculty members have a voluntary opportunity to make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service; and

(2) That the voluntary retirement option be available to all faculty at age 55 after completing 20 years of full time service or at age 60 after completing ~~15~~ 10 years of full time service; and

(3) That the voluntary retirement option be accompanied by a financial incentive in the form of a lumpsum severance bonus to be negotiated between the individual faculty member and the administration; and

(4) That the administration consider providing a partial retirement option prior to or in conjunction with the voluntary retirement; and

(5) That consideration be given to ~~providing~~ enhancing post retirement part-time teaching opportunities, office space, computer and library facilities, continued health insurance premiums and reimbursements for financial planning services to the retiring faculty; and

(6) That a voluntary retirement option be made available and known to the faculty of the University.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support
Approved April 19, 1994

Recommitted, 9/9/94

Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support

Voluntary Retirement Opportunities and Incentives

The 1978 amendments to Age Discrimination in Employment Act raised the mandatory retirement age for college faculty from 65 to 70. In 1986, U.S. Congress passed further amendments that eliminated ("uncapped") the mandatory retirement altogether, effective January 1, 1994. Universities and colleges nationwide have been examining ways of responding to the challenge of no mandatory retirement for their faculty. At The George Washington University, the Faculty Senate made an effort in this direction by adopting Resolution 90/15 on April 12, 1991 that asked the Vice President for Academic Affairs to direct each school to devise plans to facilitate the voluntary retirement of senior faculty.

In response to Faculty Senate Resolution 90/15, the Administration set up a Task Force on Post Tenure Evaluation of Continuing Faculty. The recommendations of this Task Force, though technically withdrawn, were the subject of a heated debate in the Faculty Senate during February of last year and resulted in the adoption of Resolution 92/4 which reaffirmed the principles of tenure and academic freedom, and rejected the imposition of additional peer review of tenured faculty; the Senate also opposed "threats or processes of harassment to 'encourage' retirement of faculty."

Early in the current academic year, the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support invited Vice-President French to discuss the issue of early retirement at GW and to begin a dialogue. Dr. French informed the committee that he has been talking to an average of 2 faculty members per month about early or partial retirement and that the University enters into about 8 such arrangements each year. The committee discussed the needs of the retired faculty, the vitality of existing faculty, the proverbial "deadwood", and the nexus between "early retirement" and post-tenure evaluation.

There is a widespread concern, nationwide, that with an aged, top heavy faculty, the younger faculty would have fewer opportunities for tenured positions [Voluntary Incentive Early Retirement Programs, TIAA/CREF *Research Dialogues*, July 1988]. It is of interest to note that in order to reduce the size of the government without resorting to layoffs, the federal agencies recently began to offer a Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (Buyouts) program that allows a federal employee of 12 months service the lesser of $25,000 or his/her severance pay entitlement [*Washington Post*, March 28, 1994, p. A19].

The Committee met several times to consider the incentives for voluntary retirement of active senior faculty. The present practice has been that any faculty member may approach his/her chair, dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or the VPAA directly) to negotiate an early retirement package. The committee believes that there ought to be broad guidelines that are available and known to all faculty contemplating

retirement. It has been pointed out that many faculty members considering possible retirement would wish to maintain academic relationship with the University and would appreciate the availability of office space, secretarial assistance and part-time teaching privileges at better than the current part-time rates. The other consideration is the possible transition from full time to part time status prior to voluntary retirement.

The Committee discovered that the University of Chicago has recently adopted and implemented a voluntary retirement plan that provides a "window period" during which the eligible faculty members make an irrevocable decision to retire from active service and receive financial incentives based upon an announced formula. The Committee had access to the Chicago report, Report of the Task Force on Faculty Retirement (November 1992) as well as the implementation documents dated July 2, 1993 from the University of Chicago. It is felt that a comparable project at GWU could not be undertaken solely by our committee; such a project would require much broader involvement of many other groups such as the ASPP Committee, Budget Review Committee, Administration and Board of Trustees. However, the Committee is convinced that there is a need to have a voluntary, without coercion of any sort, retirement plan that is known and available to all faculty members.

There is agreement that any retirement proposal should be voluntarily initiated by the faculty members. Once a faculty member declares his/her intent to retire from the University, and negotiates and accepts a severance package, the intent becomes irrevocable. The present 'early retirement' policy at GWU allows a faculty member to retire at age 55 after 20 years service or at age 60 after 10 years service. The committee believes this should continue to be the policy for voluntary retirement.

In recent years, many faculty members contemplating early retirement have approached the administration and worked out individual packages of benefits, some involving lumpsum payments and others providing payments spread over a number of years. The Committee knows of a number of cases where the recently retired faculty members were unaware that they could have approached the administration and worked out an individual package for themselves. The Committee believes that, in fairness to all faculty members, the availability of financial incentives on voluntary retirement should be known to all faculty members. In fact, the present resolution merely recapitulates the present practice at GWU with one change: it alerts the faculty to their opportunities for negotiating a satisfactory retirement package for themselves.

Under the new policy at the University of Chicago, each faculty member taking advantage of the voluntary opportunities is offered reimbursements, up to $3000, for financial planning services within 12 months of declaring their intent to retire. The Committee recommends that provision of financial planning services by an outside counsellor be considered as a fringe benefit for all faculty approaching retirement.

Many faculty members approaching retirement wish to continue their teaching and/or

research activities at the university. For them it is important to have office space, and continued access to secretarial, computer and library facilities. The Committee recommends the university provide a central space, if not possible within departments or schools, for emeriti faculty. The possibility of providing part-time opportunities to the retired faculty should also be considered insofar they meet the departmental needs. Consideration should be given to provide such teaching opportunities at better than part-time rates.

The continued availability of health insurance is an important factor in consideration of retirement by faculty members and their spouses. Under the new policy at the University of Chicago, the University pays *lifetime* premiums for each participating faculty member and spouse for university sponsored health insurance that supplements Medicare. While the enactment of Health Care Reform legislation may make this consideration moot, it is recommended that The George Washington University consider providing increased health insurance benefits to retired faculty and continue them beyond age 70.

The George Washington University presently provides educational benefits to retired faculty members and their eligible dependents. The committee recommends that this practice should continue unchanged.

The Committee also considered the availability of a partial retirement option prior to full retirement and recommends that GWU develop phased retirement policies that would allow the faculty members to declare irrevocable intent to retire after a number of years (to be negotiated between the faculty member and the administration). During the intervening years, the faculty members would continue to work at less than full time (1/2 or 2/3) effort. At the end of the negotiated period of partial retirement, the faculty member would retire and be eligible to obtain the negotiated retirement benefits.

Committee on Faculty Development and Support
April 19, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, Ext. 47094.]

**A RESOLUTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE NONCONCURRENCES WITH FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS (94/2)**

**WHEREAS,** after consultation with the leadership of the Board of Trustees, the Administration has now been authorized to suggest that the section of the Faculty Code (Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code, B.4.) pertaining to administrative nonconcurrences remain unchanged, but that there be an alternate process which might be elected at the discretion of the department or program wishing to appeal an administrative nonconcurrence with a faculty personnel recommendation; and

**WHEREAS,** at its discretion, the department or program may elect to leave the final decision to the President of the University, thus meeting the Administration's request and being consistent with the current language of the Faculty Code; NOW, THEREFORE

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

(1) That in the event the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate is unable to resolve the nonconcurrence, the department or program may waive its right of disposition of an administrative nonconcurrence by the Board of Trustees under the provisions of Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code (Section B.4. of the Faculty Code) and elect to leave the decision to the President of the University; and

(2) That the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom ~~consider the addition of~~ be directed to prepare language reflecting the above to the Faculty Code~~.~~ for decision by the Faculty Senate.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
October 13, 1994

Adopted, as amended, October 14, 1994

Faculty Senate Meeting
October 14, 1994
Resolution 94/2

# CHRONOLOGY OF RESOLUTION ON NONCONCURRENCE PROCESS

## OCTOBER, 1993

The Board of Trustees by resolution took itself out of the process of administrative nonconcurrences with faculty recommendations, as specified by the Faculty Code.

That process provides for the Board of Trustees to make the final decision when the Executive Committee has been unable to resolve the matter and the department or program has decided not to withdraw its recommendation.

In its October resolution, the Board indicated that it no longer wished to be part of this process, and that it should terminate with the President of the University, giving him final disposition. It further instructed the Faculty Senate and the administration to work out the appropriate language for insertion in the Faculty Code. The resolution was made effective as of October 1, 1993.

The Executive Committee reported back to the Senate with respect to the Board's action. The consensus of the Senate was that, in a system of shared governance and because of the contractual character of the Code, such unilateral action without consultation with the faculty was not acceptable.

The Senate then passed a resolution which requested that the Board rescind its resolution pending full consultation with the faculty in the manner dictated by the Code.

## JANUARY, 1994

Two members of the Executive Committee (Professors Johnston and Robinson) met with the Executive Committee of the Board, presenting the case for maintaining the present system, as specified in the Code, and the need to retain the involvement of the Board of Trustees, as a neutral body. Also presented was an alternative to the current system, the use of an external arbitration group.

## FEBRUARY, 1994

The Board of Trustees passed a second resolution, calling for the administration and the Senate to work on developing an appropriate process for handling administrative nonconcurrences, which would relieve the Trustees of participation in the process.

It further urged consideration of all available processes except external arbitration.

It set a deadline for submission of a plan by April 15.

In response to the Board's resolution, the Executive Committee appointed three of its members and two members from the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee to an Ad Hoc Committee. Vice President French appointed two deans and, at the request of the Executive Committee, he also joined the group.

The first meeting was convened in January. Faculty and administration views were presented and debated.

The faculty, reflecting the spirit of the Code and the wishes of the Faculty Senate, urged the retention of a neutral deciding body and the administration urged that the process terminate with the President.

The group continued to meet on a regular basis, and the Senate was advised on these meetings.

MARCH, 1994

By March, the Ad Hoc Group focused on a process in which a panel of elected faculty and two members (faculty and/or administration) appointed by the President, would serve as the decisional body.

This plan was presented to the Faculty Assembly at its meeting in March.

At the Faculty Senate meeting, held later that week, the Senate supported that plan.

APRIL, 1994

The Ad Hoc Committee met with the President to discuss the proposed system. At this meeting the President indicated that the solution which did not vest decisional authority in the President was not acceptable.

At its meeting in April, the Senate passed a resolution reconfirming its previous position, in support of the March proposal, but after discussion provided for a single remand opportunity for the President.

APRIL 28, 1994

The Ad Hoc Committee met with the President, and the administration proposed a variation on the system which provided for the President's reconsideration of a nonconcurrence when the panel was not unanimous in its decision and in cases where, on remand, the panel sustained its original recommendation, the President would transmit the decision to the Board with his recommendation for action.

As this process was not consistent with the expressed wishes of the Senate, the faculty members of the Committee found the new proposal unacceptable.

On April 29, the administration proposed another version of the above, but one that would again provide for transmission to the Board with the President's recommendation.

JUNE, 1994

The Executive Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee faculty members began discussions on the most recent proposal, responding to it by memorandum on June 28.

As this revised proposal was still inconsistent with the expressed will of the Senate, the Executive Committee proposed modifications which would satisfy those expressed concerns.

AUGUST, 1994

In late August, the Executive Committee received a memorandum from Vice President French, indicating that the Board and the administration would agree to leave the nonconcurrence process as stated in the Faculty Code, but wished to have the insertion of a second option available to the department or program. That option would provide for the President to make the decision. The administration further requested the insertion of this option in the Faculty Code section dealing with nonconcurrences.

SEPTEMBER, 1994

After communications, which began September 1, with the administration on the above, and after lengthy deliberations by the faculty (i.e., the members of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Executive Committee), the Executive Committee prepared the resolution distributed to the Senate on October 14, 1994.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
**OCTOBER 14, 1994**
**PROFESSOR LILIEN F. ROBINSON, CHAIR**

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I would like to report on the following matters.

## I. GRIEVANCES

The Executive Committee was advised by Professor Robert Park of the National Law Center that in the matter of the grievance in the Medical School, "further efforts at mediation would be futile." A formal complaint has been filed by the grievant with the Executive Committee.

## II. NONCONCURRENCES

The Executive Committee has submitted its report with respect to the nonconcurrence case in the Arts and Sciences previously reported to the Senate.

## III. APPOINTMENTS

The Executive Committee appointed Professor Charles A. Garris and Professor Teresa A. Murphy, representatives from the Advisory Council on Research, to the Senate Research Committee.

## IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) The next meeting of the Executive Committee is Friday, October 28, 1994. Please note that any items of business for the Senate's agenda for the November meeting should be forwarded to the Executive Committee before October 28th.

(2) Chairs of Senate Standing Committees are asked to present interim reports at the November 11th Senate meeting.

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Murli M. Gupta, Chair, Committee on Faculty Development and Support Ext. 44857.]

SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE ON RETIREMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND INCENTIVES TO FACULTY (94/3)

WHEREAS, there is no fixed age retirement for the University faculty as of 1/1/94; and

WHEREAS, many faculty members requesting voluntary early retirement have heretofore obtained certain financial and other benefits as part of their retirement package and such practice needs to continue under a future Voluntary Retirement Policy; and

WHEREAS, any future Voluntary Retirement Policy would have academic, fiscal and personnel implications for the academic departments and schools, and for the operating budget of the University; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That a joint faculty-administration Task Force be established to examine the range of financial and other benefits that could be provided by the University to retiring faculty, to assess the future cost and policy implications of such benefits, and to consider the establishment of a comprehensive scheme of incentives and benefits that might be available to the retiring faculty; and

(2) That the Task Force consist of four faculty members to be nominated by the Executive Committee for election by the Faculty Senate. One of these nominees will be a member of the Faculty Senate and will co-chair the Task Force. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will co-chair the Task Force and will appoint two additional members; and

(3) That the Task Force solicit input from the faculty and report its findings and recommendations to the Faculty Senate. A preliminary report should be prepared for the April 1995 Senate meeting and a final report should be prepared for the April 1996 Senate meeting.

Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Development and Support
Approved November 11, 1994

Adopted, as amended, November 11, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Phyllis D. Kind, Chair, Committee on Research, Ext. 42908.]

SUBSTITUTE

# A RESOLUTION ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR RESEARCH (94/4)

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate is convinced that the value and stature of The George Washington University as an educational institution, to its students, to its faculty and to the nation at large, would be enhanced by increasing the level of scholarly research; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate believes the opportunities, facilities and incentives for the conduct of scholarly research should be increased for faculty in all of the Schools and Departments of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate, through its Research Committee, has evaluated the constraints on scholarly research and the incentives for the conduct of that research at The George Washington University, and published the results of this study in its 1991 report; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate believes that the 1994 Strategic Plan for Research recognizes the constraints on the opportunities for the conduct of scholarly research at The George Washington University and proposes a series of measures designed to alleviate many of these barriers and enhance research opportunities;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the Faculty Senate endorses ~~wholeheartedly~~ this Strategic Plan for Research and urges its ~~complete and speedy~~ implementation by the University Administration across all of the Schools and Departments of the University.

Research Committee
December 8, 1994

Adopted December 9, 1994

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Phyllis D. Kind, Chair, Committee on Research, Ext. 42908.]

see preceding Substitute

# A RESOLUTION ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR RESEARCH (94/4)

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate is convinced that the value and stature of The George Washington University as an educational institution, to its students, to its faculty and to the nation at large, would be enhanced by increasing the level of scholarly research; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate believes the opportunities, facilities and incentives for the conduct of scholarly research should be increased for faculty in all of the Schools and Departments of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate, through its Research Committee, has evaluated the constraints on scholarly research and the incentives for the conduct of that research at The George Washington University, and published the results of this study in its 1991 report; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate believes that the 1994 Strategic Plan for Research recognizes the constraints on the opportunities for the conduct of scholarly research at The George Washington University and proposes a series of measures designed to alleviate many of these barriers and enhance research opportunities;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the Faculty Senate endorses wholeheartedly this Strategic Plan for Research and urges its complete and speedy implementation by the University Administration across all of the Schools and Departments of the University.

Research Committee
October 24, 1994

Postponed, November 11, 1994, to the December 9, 1994, Senate meeting

# The George Washington University

# Strategic Plan for Research

# 1994-95

Adopted by the University Advisory Council on Research
15 April 1994

## Table of Contents

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## RESEARCH MISSION AT GW

**The research mission of the University is to create and synthesize knowledge at the frontiers of our understanding and to use that knowledge to address issues of increasing complexity in our world, while strengthening the necessary ties between teaching and research.**

To realize its research mission, GW must focus its interests and commit its resources towards the achievement of certain goals. In the realm of scholarly activity and research, the following goals define the long-term outcomes that GW expects to attain:

### GOALS

*Goal 1.* ***Enhance the reputation of GW as a research oriented University.***

*Goal 2.* ***Enrich through research the quality of undergraduate and graduate teaching.***

*Goal 3.* ***Develop a more productive research culture and environment at GW.***

*Goal 4.* ***Increase the research productivity of both faculty and students.***

*Goal 5.* ***Increase the amount of sponsored research at GW.***

*Goal 6.* ***Attract top faculty and students to GW.***

In order to achieve the stated research goals, the Advisory Council on Research has prioritized objectives selected for realization over the next four years. According to year, they are as follows:

## OBJECTIVES CURRENTLY BEING PURSUED -- AY's 93-95

**Priority 1:** Development of a New University Patent Policy
**Priority 2:** Rigorous Review of Centers and Institutes
**Priority 3:** Development of an Administrative Research Structure within each School (excluding the SMHS)
**Priority 4:** Creation of a Pre-award and Post-award Infrastructure (excluding the SMHS)

## OBJECTIVES -- 1994-95 THREE-YEAR PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS

Year #1 -- 1994-95 Period:

**Priority 1:** Tuition Awards Linked to Sponsored Graduate-Student Stipends (excluding the SMHS)
**Priority 2:** Full Funding of Research Enhancement Incentive Awards (excluding the SMHS)
**Priority 3:** Release Time Associated with Research Activity (excluding the SMHS)

Year #2 -- 1995-96 Period

**Priority 1:** Increase the University Facilitating Fund (excluding the SMHS)
**Priority 2:** Faculty Start-Up Funds (excluding the SMHS)
**Priority 3:** Equipment Cost-Sharing Funds (excluding the SMHS)

Year #3 -- 1996-97 Period

**Priority 1:** Increase Research Enhancement Funds Program
**Priority 2:** Development of Central Facilities for Research Needs

## FOREWORD

In the last few years considerable changes have occurred at The George Washington University (GW) in its recognition of the role of research and general scholarly activity. Formerly perceived by many as primarily a teaching institution, GW is now a leading example of an educational institution wherein research plays an essential role in the teaching, scholarly, and service activities of the faculties. Teaching and research are tightly interlinked in such a way that in today's universities they cannot be separated. More and more with respect to faculty service to the community at large, research plays a role in solving local and global problems, whether through the synthesis of existing knowledge to provide alternative solutions or through the creation of new knowledge as problems and opportunities demand. Such is the environment in which today we see GW as a truly research oriented University.

For the near term, it is likely that overall resources to achieve the many goals and aspirations of the University community will remain essentially constant. As a consequence, the new three-year budgetary planning cycle, initiated for the first time in the Fall of 1993 for FY-95, plays an increasingly important role for the University and its faculty with regard to research aspirations. In order to discuss the research goals of the faculty rationally, it is essential that there be a consensus as to our goals and objectives. Moreover, there must be agreement on how to achieve those goals and objectives without, in any way, compromising a continual striving for excellence in the overall research enterprise. In particular, the objectives need to be presented in a prioritized format, delineated over a three-year time period, with the understanding that the prioritization is subject to review and possible revision each succeeding year. It is the aim of the Advisory Council on Research to produce a document that is

consistent with the objectives of the various Schools and that gives the research priorities as set by the faculty of the University. This Strategic Plan for Research will be the guiding document for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies in yearly planning and budget presentations first to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and subsequently to the University President and the Vice President and Treasurer.

This first version of the Strategic Plan for Research focuses solely on the basic items of concern to the research community at GW. Issues associated with research computing, to mention one major area of importance, were not addressed because of the limited time available to produce the Plan. Attempts were not made this year to define standards against which measurements can be made as to outcomes of various efforts. However, with each succeeding year, we expect that the Strategic Plan for Research will become increasingly more comprehensive, and eventually will reflect all the issues associated with research at GW. We intend, through the strategic planning process, to unlock all the outstanding potential for research pursuits at GW.

## THE IMMEDIATE PAST AND PRESENT

The present climate for research at GW had its beginning in February 1984 when President Lloyd Elliott asked the University Committee on Research to identify obstacles to research in the University and to offer recommendations to facilitate research efforts. Under the chairmanship of Henry Solomon, who was then Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the document "Obstacles to Research" was published in May of 1985. It gave evaluations and recommendations on essentially all key issues associated with research from graduate student support to computing. It set the stage for the implementation

of numerous improvements of the research environment over the intervening years, e.g., "It is essential that the levels of graduate student support continue to be increased so that we may attain stipend levels competitive with the major research institutions." This has been achieved by substantial increases for graduate teaching assistantships and through the introduction of special Presidential Merit Fellowships to attract truly outstanding graduate students to GW.

The next important landmark occurred through the efforts of Carl Lange, former Vice President for Research and Administration, and Anthony Coates, former Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research. In May 1989 they produced, in consultation with numerous faculty and input from the Deans of the Schools, the document "Strategies for Research: Toward Growth and Competitiveness." In some sense, this document served as an initial strategic plan for strengthening research. From it emerged two important innovations: The Advisory Council on Research and The Research Enhancement Fund. The Advisory Council on Research is appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is chaired by the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Its membership (see last two pages of this document) consists of 14 voting members and 3 ex-officio members: 8 voting members recommended by the Deans of each School (CCGSAS - 2, SEHD, SBPM, SEAS, ESIA, NLC, and SMHS each 1); 6 voting at-large members recommended by the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies; ex-officio members consisting of a representative from the Gelman library, the director of Sponsored Research, and the director of the Office of Medical Sponsored Projects. This year, for the first time, two members from the Faculty Senate Committee on research sit on the Advisory Council on

Research and vice versa, with the aim of unifying all the best thinking of the faculty and the administration on research. In conjunction, a joint meeting of the two committees was held this spring to discuss the first draft of the Strategic Plan for Research.

The Research Enhancement Fund, with an initial allocation of $300,000 that has, however, remained fixed since its inception, came into being as part of a three-pronged proposal: 1) strengthening of existing nationally-ranked research programs according to a plan of strategic selection; 2) support of proposals for new departmental or interdisciplinary programs submitted through deans to the Advisory Council on Research for consideration; 3) encouragement of individuals to apply for research support from the University Committee on Research. For a limited number of nationally-ranked programs, the first proposal has been realized. However, due to the fixed value of the Research Enhancement Fund, item two has essentially not occurred at all.

The Lange-Coates statement of strategies was followed in May 1991 by a special report of the Faculty Senate Research Committee, then chaired by Professor Barry Berman, entitled "Research at GW: Constraints and Incentives." This report took a broader perspective in that it was based on surveys of many University faculty, as well as department chairs and program directors. Numerous recommendations were contained in the report: methods for achieving teaching-load accommodations for research-active faculty; proposals for several kinds of support and incentives for research-active faculty to do more and better research and for faculty who are not involved in research to become so; re-emphasis of the importance of graduate-student support, especially for doctoral students and research-active departments; suggestions

for structural changes in regard to facilities, equipment, and infrastructure to make GW even more hospitable to researchers; and reiteration that department chairs and program directors have important responsibilities for promoting research at the departmental level and communicating research outside the University. One response to this report emerged as a study entitled "Flexible Faculty Work Plans: Evaluating Implementation of Alternative Methods" that appeared in 1992. Internally, this latter report is known as the Coates-Cohen-Garris report. It created a model of various elements of faculty workloads expressed as "course equivalents". This basic model is being refined and expanded with data collection underway to facilitate further implementation.

In addition to the Research Enhancement Fund, which mainly has as its purpose the provision of additional funding for selected key areas of research with established track records, there are two other GW sources of funds for scholarly activity. The first is the primary source for non-sponsored research: the University Facilitating Fund (UFF). The UFF is administered by the University Committee on Research (UCR). This year, the UCR received 80 proposals requesting total funding of $631,717. Of these 80 proposals, 24 were approved for funding that required $206,445. It was possible this year to fund three more proposals because of a $30,000 grant from the Loughran Foundation for faculty research support that was added to the UFF. The competition for the UFF grants is stiff due to the limited funds and the outstanding proposals received. The second source of funds is through a major new program begun this year on a three-year trial basis: Research Enhancement Incentive Awards or REIA's. The REIA's are derived from sponsored research dollars using a formula based on the net direct costs, net indirect costs, and tuition support funds. Using actual expenditures on a given grant or contract award at the end of the fiscal

year, the REIA for each principal investigator (PI) of a given School is calculated and then divided equally among the PI, the Department, and the Dean of the School. This year, a total of $446,000 was distributed on the basis of sponsored research activity for the year ending 30 June 1993. The aim is that these funds be used to enhance scholarly research at the University and to increase sponsored research levels.

## SPONSORED RESEARCH: WHERE DO WE STAND?

Several measures can be used to evaluate our situation with regard to sponsored research activity. One is Federal Obligations to GW. This is the common classification used in the ***Chronicle of Higher Education***. In Table I given below, GW clearly sits on the borderline of the list of the top 100 universities for Research and Development moneys, but somewhat below that for Total Federal Obligations. Total Federal Obligations differ from Research and Development moneys in that they include training grants, grants for graduate student support, etc. Figures for FY 92 are not yet available.

Table I. Federal Obligations

| Fiscal Year | R & D | Standing | Total Federal | Standing |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FY 90 | $23,387 K | # 98 | $29,299 K | # 117 |
| FY 91 | $22,824 K | # 108 | $34,461 K | # 113 |

Another method of assessing standing is through Federal Research and Development Expenditures. For FY 92, GW had $28,158 K in this category for a ranking of 104, again just outside the top 100 universities.

Of course, it must be remembered that not all sponsored research dollars come from the Federal Government. At GW, a significant fraction comes from

private sources that support research, e.g., foundations. As can be seen in Table II, total sponsored research revenue dollars currently exceed $43,000 K. The FY 93 total of $43,232,516 derives from $13,739,584 for the Medical Center and $29,492,932 for the remainder of the University.

Table II. Total Sponsored Research Revenue Dollars

| | |
|---|---|
| 1987 | $27,582,329 |
| 1988 | $33,020,749 |
| 1989 | $37,248,652 |
| 1990 | $39,679,431 |
| 1991 | $39,498,903 |
| 1992 | $43,126,523 |
| 1993 | $43,232,516 |

Though one might initially conclude that sponsored revenue grew by somewhat more than 56% from 1987 to 1993, in actuality, when adjustments are made for inflation during this period, the growth is still a commendable 23%.

## RESEARCH MISSION AT GW

The George Washington University is a comprehensive university with broad responsibility for education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. To meet this responsibility at the highest level, the inextricable link between teaching and research comes to the fore in two ways: the professor/researcher transmits knowledge that has been created to the students; students serving as research assistants learn and conduct research themselves under the professor/researcher. This synergism is manifest in the statement of the research mission of GW:

> **The <u>research mission</u> of the University is to create and synthesize knowledge at the frontiers of our understanding and to use that**

**knowledge to address issues of increasing complexity in our world, while strengthening the necessary ties between teaching and research.**

## GOALS

To realize its research mission, GW must focus its interests and commit its resources towards the achievement of certain goals. Goals evolve with time as resources, national issues, and opportunities change. Therefore, while the following goals define the long-term outcomes that GW expects to attain, some are qualitative in that they do not allow for specific measurable outcomes over a specific time span, whereas others are quantitative and can be measured with a set time for their accomplishment.

*Goal 1.* ***Enhance the reputation of GW as a research oriented University.***

*Goal 2.* ***Enrich through research the quality of undergraduate and graduate teaching.***

*Goal 3.* ***Develop a more productive research culture and environment at GW.***

*Goal 4.* ***Increase the research productivity of both faculty and students.***

*Goal 5.* ***Increase the amount of sponsored research at GW.***

*Goal 6.* ***Attract top faculty and students to GW.***

## OBJECTIVES

In order to strive toward achievement of the stated research goals, the Advisory Council on Research, in consultation with the Senate Committee on Research, has considered 16 objectives for prioritization. Of these 16 objectives, 12 have been selected for realization over a four-year period beginning with the current year and the remaining 4 have been dropped. Of the 12 selected, 4 are currently being pursued by the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies as items that require immediate attention. The remaining 8 have been prioritized for realization over a three-year period beginning in FY 96 and therefore are to be presented for consideration during the 1994-95 planning and budget process.

## OBJECTIVES CURRENTLY BEING PURSUED -- AY 93-94

**Priority 1:** Develop a New University Patent Policy

**Objective** -- The current Patent Policy of the University is antiquated. Therefore, it is essential that we modernize the University's Patent Policy in a way that encourages faculty to apply for patents through the University. **Cost** -- The cost is not associated with the drafting of a new Patent Policy, but rather in the consequences that follow. At the moment, the only financed mechanism for pursuing patent searches and potential patent applications is through the Research Corporation. However, the latter is not perceived by the faculty as the best way to proceed. Therefore, one outgrowth of a new Patent Policy may be the need to develop an alternative set of funds intrinsic to the University that can be used for patent searches and patent applications somewhat as a risk capital venture for the University. Of course, this would necessitate some kind of

internal review mechanism to determine which patent proposals are worthy of support as opposed to going through the Research Corporation. **Benefit** -- An active patent and technology transfer program has the potential of bringing further research funds to the University. **Goals supported** -- 1, 3, and 6.

**Priority 2:** Centers and Institutes

**Objective** -- The aim is to maintain a rigorous procedure for the chartering and renewing of charters for Centers and Institutes within the University consistent with academic program goals and priorities. Centers are viewed as being entities within schools or departments that involve a number of faculty who are working towards a common scholarly aim, while Institutes are broader and usually involve interdisciplinary collaboration across schools. Rarely, if ever, should one faculty member alone serve as the focal point of a Center. The primary purpose of forming either a Center or an Institute is to enhance scholarly activity and, in particular, to make a more visible and viable collaboration of faculty and graduate students for the purpose of bringing funding to the activity from outside sources. Within this framework, Centers and Institutes are reviewed for chartering and renewal. **Cost** -- On occasion, the University may decide to create a Center of Excellence and fund a Center or Institute through the Research Enhancement Funds Program. Otherwise, the cost lies primarily in the space and organization required to make the Center or Institute function. Moreover, in many cases, such activities bring in funds and as a result are a very positive undertaking for the University in the sense of recognition and quality academic activity. **Benefit** -- Productive Centers and Institutes have the potential of bringing considerable recognition to the University. **Goals supported** -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

**Priority 3:** Development of an Administrative Research Structure within each School (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- The aim is to have an individual in each school designated as the person responsible for working with the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies for the purpose of pursuing sponsored-research projects consistent with the School's priorities and graduate program aims. This person most likely would be an Associate Dean responsible for Graduate Programs and thereby also responsible for Research. In addition, this person would also oversee the staff person who would provide the liaison between the Office of Sponsored Research and the particular School for the pre- and post-award assistance as discussed below under Internal Infrastructure. **Cost** -- The main cost would be the shifting of responsibilities of an Associate Dean in each school or the creation of a new Associate Dean's position in each school for this purpose. However, it would give a very strong signal to all faculties of the importance of scholarly and sponsored-research pursuits. **Benefits** -- Through collaborative interactions with the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, targets of opportunity for external funding of research should always be known and can be pursued in a timely fashion with high quality proposals from appropriate faculty of the School. **Goals supported** -- 1, 3, 4, and 5.

**Priority 4:** Infrastructure (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- There is considerable evidence that a centralized group of individuals (under the Office of Sponsored Research) is needed whose dedicated task is to provide pre-award and post-award assistance to faculty from all schools in proposal writing and grant or contract administration. For the pre-award phase, this group might provide assistance in gathering of information or

writing of standard material, development of budgets, etc. The would-be principal investigator then needs to focus solely on the basic proposal writing that only s/he can do. After the award is received, this group would be available to assist principal investigators in the paperwork of appointments, procurement, travel, etc. A proposed organization for this structure is that each school would have a 'point' person through whom all requests are made (see directly above under Development of an Administrative Research Structure within Schools). The purpose of that proposal is to have a central focus in each school for organization, presentation, and monitoring of requests. **Cost** -- It is estimated that initially three positions would need to be added to the OSR staff, in addition to the reassignment of duties to a staff person in each school. Some of these positions for OSR might be created by centralization of existing capabilities from the schools, but with the understanding that no school lose any of its current services in this area. **Benefits**-- Two primary benefits will accrue from such a resource: 1) Quick response can be achieved on Requests for Proposals, especially those that require collaborations across Schools. 2) After awards are made, PI's can focus their efforts primarily on the research rather than spending inordinate amounts of time on administrative tasks associated with the presence of the grant or contract. **Goals supported** -- 3, 4, 5, and 6.

## OBJECTIVES -- 1994-95 THREE-YEAR PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS

Year #1 -- 1994-95 Period:

**Priority 1:** Tuition Awards Linked to Sponsored Graduate-Student Stipends (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- In certain cases, funding agencies are willing to grant graduate-student stipend support with the proviso that the University waive or contribute the associated tuition. Such support from the funding agency is strictly for educational purposes (stipends do not require indirect costs) and enhancement of the particular scholarly activity. In turn, GW is enabled to attract first-rate graduate students who otherwise would not matriculate here. Currently, GW has in place six such arrangements with specific grants. It is proposed that such tuition matching be extended for all new research proposals (awards), not non-competitive renewals, at the discretion of the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. **Cost** -- The cost to GW in the sense of budget accounting is the waived tuition. As an absolute upper limit, it is estimated that such a program might generate as many as four stipends a month (required to be at least $10,000 per stipend per year to qualify for a tuition waiver of 18 hours maximum) associated with received grants or contracts. The dollar amount of tuition waived is not expected to exceed $500,000. More importantly, this does not imply equivalent displaced tuition dollars, but rather the opportunity to attract additional first-rate graduate students. **Benefit** -- With such grant funds, the University enhances its graduate-level research activity and in many cases achieves a critical mass of individuals working towards a common research aim. Furthermore, it is likely to lead to more research grants and contracts. **Goals supported** -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

**Priority 2:** Research Enhancement Incentive Awards (REIAs) (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- The purpose of the REIAs is to expand the sponsored and non-sponsored scholarly activity within the University. This is achieved through the University-wide program of returning to the Principal Investigators, the Departments, and the Deans, an amount of money based on the sponsored activity in their schools or departments. The current formula is based on the direct costs, indirect costs recovered, and the amount of tuition moneys associated with the sponsored project. For sponsored activity during the 1992-93 AY, $446K was so distributed. Currently, the source of these moneys is the unaugmented budget of the Office of Academic Affairs. Our proposal is that these funds be allocated as a separate line-item in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, i.e., they should be separately funded independent of other Academic Affairs needs. Furthermore, funds for this program should be set up to allow flexibility for growth as sponsored research activity in the University increases. **Cost** -- The proposal is that this should be a line item in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies and should grow at the rate of $150K per year for three years. Assuming that sponsored research activity at the University will increase, the resulting total of $450K will not be a sufficient yearly allocation in the long term. A recommended procedure to handle requirements beyond the allocation for a given year is that the excess be added from Academic Affairs with the provision that an appropriate addition be made to the base allocation in the following year to make up the difference. In this manner, the allocation might always be slightly below requirements, but at the same time, the gap each year would remain small. **Benefit** -- This will free funds in Academic Affairs

for other scholarly and related requirements. **Goals supported** -- The REIAs support goals 1, 3, 4, and 5.

**Priority 3:** Release Time Associated with Research Activity (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- Current teaching-load requirements do not allow faculty enough time to conduct research and publish in a competitive manner with comparable institutions. The teaching load is normally a full nine hours per semester in addition to all the ancillary advising of students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (including theses and dissertations) for many faculty who have a strong interest in increasing their scholarly productivity. Of those teaching-load reductions that exist, approximately 2/3 are not directly in support of research, and those that are related to research are, in many instances, buy-out reductions (see the may 1991 Faculty Senate Research Committee Report - p. 5). Research active faculty need course release time to write proposals, conduct research, and to present their findings at conferences, in scholarly journals, and through books. In order to have time for sponsored-research pursuits, it is sometimes argued that one must buy out time, i.e., provide funds for course release. This requirement makes it more difficult for us to compete for outside funding with many universities where teaching loads are lower for the purpose of fostering sponsored-research activity and scholarly activities in general. Furthermore, several funding agencies normally do not provide any portion of academic year salary, but have a policy of only considering requests for two months of summer salary. Despite the absence of buy-out funds, external funding of research brings to the University monies through both direct and indirect cost recovery which in turn offset salary costs. Therefore, it becomes essential that Deans and Department Chairs remain cognizant of the importance of course release

associated with scholarly-research commitments, particularly in the case of sponsored research to which the Deans and Department Chairs have assigned priority by virtue of having signed off on the original grant submission. **Cost** -- The maximum cost involved is that of hiring part-time persons to cover course releases. The return is a higher level of productivity of the full-time faculty member with regard to his or her scholarly activity, which in turn generally leads to higher quality graduate programs and classroom teaching. **Benefit** -- A measurable outcome is enhanced scholarly activity in connection with release time. **Goals supported** -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Year #2 -- 1995-96 Period

**Priority 1:** University Facilitating Fund (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- The aim is to increase the amount of money available for award to internal proposals each year. Currently, about 80 proposals are received annually. While the quality of the proposals has been increasing steadily, the total funding has remained static. Approximately 20 to 25 awards are made each year when it would be appropriate to make 30 to 35 awards. **Cost** -- Ten more awards each year at an average of $12K per award would require an additional $120K. **Benefit** -- The University Facilitating Fund serves three funding purposes: 1) as a source of research funds for new faculty; 2) as a source of funds for those faculty in disciplines where external funding is not readily available; 3) as a source of funds for those faculty in between external funding grants or contracts. Therefore, the ability to make more awards serves to stimulate significantly the scholarly productivity of the faculty. **Goals supported** -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6

**Priority 2:** Faculty Start-Up Funds (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- In recruiting top faculty, it is often crucial to be able to offer start-up funds for scholarly activities. For faculty in the humanities, this may involve a top-of-the-line PC with associated peripheral equipment, whereas in the natural sciences this may involve sufficient funds to set up a laboratory. The provision of start-up funds is common practice at first-rate research universities. In addition, since it is critical for young faculty to attend and present scholarly papers at conferences, it is also recommended that newly appointed assistant professors be eligible for double the travel funds awarded to regular faculty for a period of three years. Any new faculty recruited should be provided with a PC at a minimum or equivalent funds for other research necessities. In today's market, a high-end PC with appropriate peripheral equipment will cost no more than $4K, while a good quality work station may cost $10K. At the same time, it is not unusual for a new chemistry professor to require $100K to set up a competitive laboratory environment, with the understanding that this would result in substantial outside funding within a three to four year period. The aim is to have a pool of money available in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies that would be available each year to be allocated according to Deans' requests and program priorities. **Cost** -- An initial fund of $100K with growth of $50K per year to a total of $200K would seem appropriate. Unused funds in this area (if any) could then be used in the area of cost-sharing on equipment as required on some grant proposals or for summer support. **Benefit** -- Faculty start-up funds are the main tool to attract top faculty while at the same time delivering the message that research is an important component of one's responsibility at GW. **Goals supported** -- 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

**Priority 3:** Equipment Cost-Sharing Funds (excluding the SMHS)

**Objective** -- The aim here is to create a realistic line item in the Office of Sponsored Research budget for cost-sharing on equipment proposals. Currently, $50K per year is available for this purpose. Usually, one or two proposals per year completely consume these available funds. As a consequence, GW is unable to compete in numerous instructional and research instrumentation grant competitions from the National Science Foundation, The Department of Energy, and several foundations. This has had the detrimental effect that some of our instructional and research laboratory equipment is not state-of-the-art, thus keeping us from being first-rate and competitive in these endeavors. **Cost** -- It is proposed that each year, over a four-year period, $50K be added to the existing $50K to build this fund to a total of $250K per year. Moreover, it is recommended that it be made widely known that these funds are available to encourage faculty to compete in competitions that lead to new instructional equipment and new research instrumentation for the University. **Benefits** -- It helps assure that faculty are in a competitive position for instrumentation grants while increasing the probability that GW will have state-of-the-art instrumentation for almost all instruction and research. **Goals supported** -- 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Year #3 -- 1996-97 Period

**Priority 1:** Research Enhancement Funds Program

**Objective** -- The original plan for this program was that the number of Centers or Institutes receiving enhancement moneys would grow to 10 or more over a period of three years. Approximately 3 1/2 years ago, this program commenced with six centers receiving a total of $300K. This funding has remained level as

has the number of centers. **Cost** -- The plan would be to add $100K per year for two years for a total cost of $200K. In addition, it would be requested that the overall final budget of $500K grow with the rate of inflation to cover salary increases, etc. **Benefit** -- The Research Enhancement Funds generally provide that extra funding necessary to permit selected groups to reach their pinnacle or to permit the initiation of a wholly new Center or Institute that otherwise would not come into being. Through such activity, the research "visibility" of the University rises. **Goals supported** -- 1, 3, 4, and 5.

**Priority 2:** Development of Central Facilities for Research Needs

**Objective** -- At present, there are dispersed facilities within departments or schools for such things as graphics needs, machine-shop work, and other specialized technical assistance. The proposal is that the administration work to inventory current capabilities in such areas and then determine whether they can be enhanced so as to make them available to all faculty. However, in those areas where there is a real deficit in skills, careful consideration should be given to developing general in-house facilities for electronics work and related needs in research endeavors. **Cost** -- At this stage, the cost is unknown, but can be estimated once the above inventory is complete. **Benefit** -- The availability of in-house facilities for general research support needs facilitates research and cuts the associated costs in both time and money. **Goals supported** -- 3, 4, and 5.

# ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RESEARCH

Members -- Academic Year 1993-94

**CHAIR**

Donald R. Lehman
Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

**ARTS AND SCIENCES**

Brian L. Boulier
Economics

J. Houston Miller
Chemistry

**ELLIOT SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

John M. Logsdon
Political Science and International Affairs

**NATIONAL LAW CENTER**

Harold Wegner
Law

**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

Ernest H. Forman
Management Science

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

Ray Rist
SEHD/Policy Center

**SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE**

Thomas A. Mazzuchi
Operations Research and Engineering Management

**SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES**

John C.LaRosa
Dean, Medical Research

**AT-LARGE MEMBERS**

Gary Fiskum
Biochemistry/Molecular Biology

Charles A. Garris
Civil, Mechanical, and Environmental Engineering

John M. Lachin
Statistics/Computer and Information Sciences

James R. Millar
International Affairs

Teresa A. Murphy
American Studies

Ruth A. Wallace
Sociology

**REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barry L. Berman<br>Physics | represented in Fall 93 by | Leonard C. Maximon<br>Physics |
| Dewey D. Wallace<br>Religion | represented during AY 93-94 by | Ravi Achrol<br>Marketing, Logistics,<br>and Operations Management |

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS**

STAFF

Astra Bain-Dowell
Director, Medical Sponsored Projects

Helen Spencer
Director, Office of Sponsored Research

OBSERVER

Chris Filstrup
Assistant University Librarian for Collections

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Walter K. Kahn, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Ext. 47186.]

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE NONCONCURRENCES WITH FACULTY RECOMMENDATIONS (94/5)

WHEREAS, the Faculty Code (Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code, Section B.4.) pertaining to administrative concurrences provides for decision concerning an administrative nonconcurrence by the Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, at its discretion, the originating ~~appropriate~~ faculty unit may, however, elect to leave the decision to the President; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That Section B.4. of the Faculty Code be amended to add the following language, underlined, at the conclusion of that Section:

". . . shall be transmitted to the Board of Trustees through the President, except that, at its discretion, the originating ~~appropriate~~ faculty unit may instead elect to leave the decision to the President."

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
November 30, 1994

Adopted, as amended, January 20, 1995

Bd approved 2/9/95

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Joseph Pelzman, Chair, Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, Ext. 4-7108]

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND THE ADOPTION OF A UNIFORM FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE MODEL (94/6)

WHEREAS, the fair and equitable allocation of financial resources is an essential component of robust University fiscal planning; and

WHEREAS, the Administration of the University periodically reviews the performance of all academic units, having both programmatic and fiscal implications for the University's faculty; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That the uniform financial performance model attached to this resolution be adopted as the official mechanism by which the fiscal performance of all units of the University is reviewed; and

(2) That the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting and the Vice President and Treasurer regularly review and update this performance model as the need arises.

Approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting on January 20, 1995.

Adopted February 10, 1995

| | | Senate Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **REVENUE** | SEAS | SBPM | CC/GSAS | GSEHD | ESIA | DUP | LAW CTR | |
| Undergraduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| Academic Year Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| Summer Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| Total Undergraduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Less: School Majors Rev. Alloc. To Other Schools | | | | | | | | |
| Non-School Majors Rev. Allocated To School | | | | | | | | |
| Total Undergraduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Degree Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Degree On Campus | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Degree Off Campus | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Degree Virginia Campus | | | | | | | | |
| EFL | | | | | | | | |
| DUP Distribution | | | | | | | | |
| Total Net Non-Degree Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Graduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| On Campus Academic Year | | | | | | | | |
| On Campus - Summer | | | | | | | | |
| Total Graduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Less: School Majors Rev. Alloc. To Other Schools | | | | | | | | |
| Non-School Majors Rev. Allocated To School | | | | | | | | |
| Total Net Graduate Tuition Revenue | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Off Campus | | | | | | | | |
| Virginia Campus | | | | | | | | |
| Total Graduate | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Other Student Fees | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Total Tuition and Fees | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Entrepreneurial Programs | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Research Direct Cost Recovery | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Cost Recovery : School | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | |
| Total Research | | | | | | | | |
| Endowment Income | | | | | | | | |
| Gifts | | | | | | | | |
| Other Receipts | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | | | | | | | | |

Senate Fis[illegible] Planning and Budgeting Committee

| EXPENDITURES | SEAS | SBPM | CC/GSAS | GSEHD | ESIA | DUP | LAW CTR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Administration & Support | | | | | | | |
| On Campus Instruction | | | | | | | |
| Off Campus Instruction | | | | | | | |
| Virginia Campus Instruction | | | | | | | |
| Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Less:School Majors Aid Alloc. To Other Schools | | | | | | | |
| Non-School Majors Aid Alloc. To School | | | | | | | |
| Total Undergraduate Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Graduate Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Less:School Majors Aid Alloc. To Other Schools | | | | | | | |
| Non-School Majors Aid Alloc. To School | | | | | | | |
| Off Campus Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Virginia Campus Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Total Graduate Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Financial Aid From Restricted Funds | | | | | | | |
| Total Financial Aid | | | | | | | |
| Entrepreneurial Programs | | | | | | | |
| Research (Direct Only) | | | | | | | |
| Other Expenditures from Restricted Funds | | | | | | | |
| Capital Expenditures Not Reported Above | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES | | | | | | | |
| **INCOME/(LOSS) BEFORE ALLOCATED COSTS** | | | | | | | |
| **CONTRIBUTION TO UNIVERSITY OVERHEAD** | | | | | | | |
| Utilities, Maintenance & Security Allocation | | | | | | | |
| Contribution to General University Overhead | | | | | | | |

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Walter K. Kahn, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Ext. 4-7186]

**A RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING THE FACULTY CODE PROVISIONS REGARDING CONFERRAL OF TENURE (94/7)**

**WHEREAS,** the Faculty Code is an express part of the contractual agreement between each member of the faculty and The George Washington University; and

**WHEREAS,** the Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code, Section B., entitled "Faculty Participation in Action Concerning Faculty Membership," Subsection 3 provides:

> "Appointments and actions affecting renewal of appointments, promotion, tenure designation, and termination of service shall normally follow faculty recommendations. Departures from this standard shall be limited to those cases involving compelling reasons."

and

**WHEREAS,** on January 26, 1977, then Vice President Harold Bright issued a memorandum attempting to shift the responsibility of establishing compelling reasons for rejecting tenure recommendations made prior to the penultimate year of the normal probationary period from the administration to the faculty that recommended early tenure; **NOW, THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

(1) That the policy on "early tenure" contained in the January 26, 1977, memorandum from [then] Vice President Bright, which states that "... recommendations for early tenure will not be approved by my office. Exceptions will be made only for compelling reasons" is in conflict with the letter and spirit of the Faculty Code; and

(2) That Faculty Senate requests the Administration to supersede the Bright memorandum with one consistent with the letter and spirit of the Faculty Code.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
November 9, 1994

Withdrawn, March 10, 1995

AMENDMENTS TO THE ACADEMIC HONOR CODE
ADOPTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE,
MARCH 10, 1995

Resolution (94/8)

# The George Washington University
# Academic Honor Code

## PREAMBLE

We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians and Administration of The George Washington University, believing academic honesty to be central to the mission of the University, commit ourselves to its high standards and to the promotion of academic integrity. Commitment to academic honesty upholds the mutual respect and moral integrity that our community values and nurtures. To this end, we have established The George Washington University Academic Honor Code.

## Article I - The Authority of the Honor Code

### Section 1 - Jurisdiction of the Honor Code

(a) The Honor Code shall have jurisdiction over the following schools within the University:
1) the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences;
2) the Elliott School of International Affairs;
3) the Graduate School of Education and Human Development;
4) the School of Business and Public Management;
5) the School of Engineering and Applied Science;
6) the Health Sciences program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

(b) This Code will apply to all programs and courses, both degree and non-degree, conducted by these schools, regardless of their location.

### Section 2 - Repeal of Prior University Policies on Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty policies of the George Washington University applicable to the aforementioned schools previous to the time of the passage of this Honor Code are hereby repealed and are for all intents and purposes null and void.

## Article II - Basic Considerations

### Section 1 - Definition of Academic Dishonesty

(a) Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.

(b) Common examples of academically dishonest behavior include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) Cheating - intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; copying from another student's examination; submitting work prepared in advance for an in-class examination; representing material prepared by another as one's own work; submitting the same work in more than one course without prior permission of both instructors; violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules of a course or program relating to academic conduct.

2) Fabrication - intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

3) Plagiarism - representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise; failure to attribute quotation, paraphrase, or borrowed facts or information.

4) Falsification and forgery of University academic documents - knowingly making a false statement, concealing material information, or forging a University official's signature on any University academic document or record. Such academic documents or records may include the application for admission, transcripts, add-drop forms, requests for advanced standing, requests to register for graduate-level courses, etc. (Falsification or forgery of non-academic University documents, such as financial aid forms, shall be considered a violation of the non-academic student disciplinary code.)

5) Facilitating academic dishonesty - intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Joseph L. Tropea, Co-Chair, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, Ext. 4-6345]

## A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACADEMIC HONOR CODE (94/8)

WHEREAS, there is currently a proposal for an Academic Honor Code being put forward by the Subcommittee on Academic Integrity of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, and;

WHEREAS, this Academic Honor Code will greatly enhance the academic reputation of the George Washington University, and;

WHEREAS, this Academic Honor Code will enhance the rights of students by holding students in various schools of the University to the same standards of academic integrity and to a uniform method of adjudication of cases of academic dishonesty, and;

WHEREAS, this Academic Honor Code will enhance the rights of faculty by providing them with institutional support for upholding the University standards of academic integrity, and;

WHEREAS, this Academic Honor Code will benefit students and faculty of the George Washington University by streamlining the bureaucracy involved when cases of academic dishonesty arise; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate approves the proposed Academic Honor Code and recommends its swift adoption and implementation by the University.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
February 17, 1995

Adopted, as amended, March 10, 1995

# The George Washington University
# Academic Honor Code

## PREAMBLE

We, the Students, Faculty, Librarians and Administration of The George Washington University, believing academic honesty to be central to the mission of the University, commit ourselves to its high standards and to the promotion of academic integrity. Commitment to academic honesty upholds the mutual respect and moral integrity that our community values and nurtures. To this end, we have established The George Washington University Academic Honor Code.

## Article I - The Authority of the Honor Code

Section 1 - Jurisdiction of the Honor Code

(a) The Honor Code shall have jurisdiction over the following schools within the University:
1) the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences;
2) the Elliott School of International Affairs;
3) the Graduate School of Education and Human Development;
4) the School of Business and Public Management;
5) the School of Engineering and Applied Science;
6) the Health Sciences program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

(b) This Code will apply to all programs and courses, both degree and non-degree, conducted by these schools, regardless of their location.

Section 2 - Repeal of Prior University Policies on Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty policies of The George Washington University applicable to the aforementioned schools previous to the time of the passage of this Honor Code are hereby repealed and are for all intents and purposes null and void. The previous academic dishonesty policies of The George Washington University shall remain in force at the National Law Center.

## Article II - Basic Considerations

Section 1 - Definition of Academic Dishonesty

(a) Academic dishonesty is defined as cheating of any kind, including misrepresenting one's own work, taking credit for the work of others without crediting them and without appropriate authorization, and the fabrication of information.

(b) Common examples of academically dishonest behavior include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) Cheating - intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise; copying from another student's examination; submitting work prepared in advance for an in-class examination; representing material prepared by another as one's own work; submitting the same work in more than one course without prior permission of both instructors; violating rules governing administration of examinations; violating any rules of a course or program relating to academic conduct.

2) Fabrication - intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

3) Plagiarism - representing the words, ideas, or sequence of ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise; failure to attribute quotation, paraphrase, or borrowed facts or information.

4) Falsification and forgery of University academic documents - knowingly making a false statement, concealing material information, or forging a University official's signature on any University academic document or record. Such academic documents or records may include the application for admission, transcripts, add-drop forms, requests for advanced standing, requests to register for graduate-level courses, etc. (Falsification or forgery of non-academic University documents, such as financial aid forms, shall be considered a violation of the non-



*NOTE: Underlining indicates new language; brackets indicate deleted language.

academic student disciplinary code.)

5) Facilitating academic dishonesty - intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

Section 2 - Reportage

(a) It is the moral responsibility, but not sanctioned obligation, of each member of the George Washington University community to respond to suspected acts of academic dishonesty by: 1) consulting the individual(s) thought to be involved and encouraging them to report it themselves, and/or 2) reporting it to the instructor involved, and/or 3) reporting it to the Honor Council.

(b) Reporting oneself after committing academic dishonesty is strongly encouraged and may be considered in determining sanctions.

Section 3 - Assignments and Examinations

(a) Instructors are solely responsible for establishing academic assignments and methods of examination.

(b) Instructors are encouraged to provide to students [on course syllabi] clear explanations of their expectations regarding the completion of assignments and examinations, including permissible collaboration.

(c) Instructors are encouraged to choose assignments and methods of examination believed to promote academic honesty. Examples of these include careful proctoring of examinations and the constant creation of fresh exams. [Where appropriate, collaborative projects and unproctored examinations may be used.] Collaborative projects and unproctored examinations do not violate the practice of academic honesty. When assigning collaborative projects or using unproctored examinations, the instructor should explicitly state the expectations of performance for all participants.

(d) Instructors are encouraged to provide opportunities for students to affirm their commitment to academic integrity in various settings, including examinations and other assignments. The following statement may be used for this purpose: "I, (student's name), affirm that I have completed this assignment/examination in accordance with the Honor Code."

**Article III - The Honor Council**

Section 1 - Mission of the Honor Council

(a) The Honor Council will be responsible for promoting academic integrity and for administering all procedures in this Code.

(b) Administrative and logistical support for the Honor Council shall be provided by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The office shall be the repository for records pertaining to the Honor Code and Honor Council.

Section 2 - Composition of the Honor Council and the Hearing Panels

(a) The Honor Council shall have members from each of the participating schools. There will be six students and four faculty members from the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences. There will be four students and two faculty members from each of the following schools: the Elliott School of International Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Human Development, the School of Business and Public Management, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science. There will be two students and one faculty member from the Health Sciences Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences. The terms of all members shall be one academic year. Members may reapply for additional terms. The process for identifying and selecting candidates to serve on the Honor Council shall be determined by the Implementation Team, as described in Article V, Section 2.

(b) At the beginning of each academic year, five presiding officers will be elected by the full

membership of the Council, from among the student members, at a meeting convened by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate. Insofar as possible, these officers shall rotate responsibility for presiding over cases. The presiding officer will have no vote in the deliberations on establishing guilt or recommending a sanction at the hearing.

(c) Hearing Panels selected from members of the Honor Council shall adjudicate all cases arising under this Code. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate will select and convene hearing panels as needed. A Hearing Panel shall be comprised of a presiding officer, two student members and two faculty members, [including the presiding officer,] as defined in Article III, Section 2, (b). Two of the members shall be from the home school of the respondent(s). One of the members shall be from the home school of the course.

(d) Cases arising in the summer may be adjudicated in the summer, providing that members of the Honor Council are available. Otherwise they will be adjudicated during the following academic year.

(e) All members of the Honor Council shall participate in training organized by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate.

Section 3 - Selection and Removal of Honor Council Members

(a) During each spring semester, a Selection Committee will handle the nomination, application and selection processes of the Honor Council members who will serve in the next academic year. This committee shall be convened by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate, and will be comprised of the following members:
1) the Faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students;
2) the Student Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students;
3) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy;
4) the Chair of the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee;
5) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or a designate;
6) the President of the Student Association or a designate.

(b) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the student members:
1) must be full-time students enrolled in a degree-granting program of the School which they are representing;
2) must have made satisfactory academic progress and be in good academic standing;
3) may not have any disciplinary record or probation of any sort;
4) may not hold any position, either elected or appointed, in the Student Association.

(c) The following criteria shall be used in the selection of the Faculty members:
1) must be full-time faculty members in the School that they are representing;
[2) may not have been the subject of any relevant disciplinary or grievance procedure;]
[3)] 2) may not be elected members of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Members of the Honor Council who are charged with any violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be suspended from participation during the pendency of the charges against them. Members found guilty of any violation of this Code or the Code of Student Conduct shall be disqualified from any further participation in the Honor Council. Faculty members involved in a pending case shall not participate on a Hearing Panel during the pendency of the charge.

(e) The Honor Council, by a two-thirds vote of the membership, may remove a member for non-participation. Each Honor Council shall, at the beginning of its term, define an expectation of participation for its members.

(f) Vacancies, as they occur, shall be filled by the Selection Committee.

Section 4 - Case Procedures

(a) Charges involving violations of the Honor Code may be initiated by either faculty, students,

librarians or administrators. Any charges must be made [within twelve working days] as expeditiously as is reasonably possible (normally within twelve working days) from the discovery of the infraction. Charges may be initiated as follows:

1) A student may initiate a charge of academic dishonesty against another student, by [either] referring the case to the faculty member involved and/or to the Honor Council. If the case is brought directly to the Honor Council, for action by a Hearing Panel, then the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs or a designate shall immediately notify the instructor of the involved course.

2) When a faculty member initiates a charge or is made aware of a violation which the faculty member determines to be substantive, the faculty member shall contact the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, in order to discover whether the student has ever been found guilty of a charge of academic dishonesty.

i) In first offense cases, the instructor [may] shall either act directly, in consultation with the Department Chair, or [may] refer the case to the Honor Council for action by a Hearing Panel. An instructor who acts directly must present the student with specific charges and a proposed sanction. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with Article III, Section 5 and Article II, Section 2 of this Code.

ii) If the faculty member acts directly then the accused student shall have the right to appeal directly to the Honor Council, for action by a Hearing Panel, should he or she disagree with the validity of the charge or the appropriateness of the sanction.

iii) Second offenses shall go directly to the Honor Council, for action by a Hearing Panel.

iv) If a faculty member is made aware of a violation which the faculty member determines not to be substantive, the faculty member shall notify the complaining student promptly.

3) All charges initiated by members of the administration or librarians shall go directly to the Honor Council, for action by a Hearing Panel.

(b) All actions, on any level, shall be recorded with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. This includes cases handled directly by instructors.

(c) Deliberation of the hearing shall occur in two stages: the establishment of guilt and the recommendation of sanction. To find a respondent guilty, three-quarters of the voting panel members must agree. If the panel finds a respondent guilty, they shall also make a recommendation of sanction. A sanction other than expulsion can be recommended by three-quarters of the voting panel members. A sanction of expulsion can only be recommended by a unanimous vote of the voting panel members.

(d) Reports of the Hearing Panel shall include a finding of fact and a determination of the guilt or innocence of the respondent. If the respondent is found guilty, then the report will also include a [recommendation] determination of sanction. Sanctions will be determined in accordance with Article III, Section 5 and Article II, Section 2 of this Code. This report shall be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will then notify the respondent of the Hearing Panel's decision of guilt or innocence and [the final] the Panel's decision [of] as to sanction. However, if in the judgment of the Vice President for Academic Affairs the sanction decided upon by the Panel is significantly at variance with sanctions imposed in closely similar cases, the decision as to sanction may be remanded to the Panel for reconsideration and possible revision before being reported to the respondent. The complainant, appropriate Department Chair and Dean shall receive a copy of the Hearing Panel's report [and the Vice President's determination of sanction].

(e) These proceedings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible. The Hearing Panels should strive to have proceedings concluded within seven weeks of the report of the violation. However, failure to do so shall not constitute a violation of this Code when extenuating circumstances reasonably excuse the delay.

Section 5 - Sanctions

(a) The minimum sanction in first offense cases shall be failure of the assignment in question. The minimum sanction in repeat violation cases shall be failure of the course. For more serious offenses sanction may be suspension from the University for a specified, minimum

time [and] or expulsion from the University. Other sanctions may be appropriate for particular cases.

(b) Sanctions of suspension or expulsion, as a result of academic dishonesty, may only be [recommended] determined by a Hearing Panel.

(c) Attempts to commit acts prohibited by this Code may be punished to the same extent as completed violations.

(d) Respondents found in violation of this Code may also be removed from certain University programs, in accordance with the regulations and bylaws of that program.

(e) All sanctions except failure of the assignment in question shall be marked on the respondent's permanent record with the phrase "Academic Dishonesty". In the case of failure of the course, the notation shall remain on the record of the respondent for a minimum of two years. In the case of suspension or expulsion, the notation shall remain on the record of the respondent for a minimum of three years. After the minimum time has elapsed, the respondent may petition to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for the removal of the sanction notation from the permanent record. This provision shall not, however, prohibit any program, department, college or school of the University from retaining records of violations and reporting violations as required by their professional standards.

Section 6 - Hearing Panel Procedural Guidelines

(a) All attendant procedures and records of the Honor Council and its Hearing Panels, from the initial charge to the final resolution, shall be strictly confidential.

(b) Respondents and complainants shall be given notice of the hearing date and the specific charges against them at least five calendar days in advance and shall be accorded reasonable access to the case file, which will be retained in the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The instructor of the involved course, appropriate academic Dean, Department Chair and the Dean of Students shall also receive notification of the pending charges within five calendar days of the hearing.

(c) The presiding officer may request the attendance of witnesses upon motion of any panel member, or of either party. Only witnesses who can provide direct knowledge about the given case shall be called. Requests must be approved by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate, and shall be personally delivered or sent by certified mail, return receipt requested. University students and employees are expected to comply with such requests. Complainants and respondents shall be accorded an opportunity to question those witnesses who testify for either party at the hearing.

(d) Hearings will occur in the absence of respondents who fail to appear after proper notice. In this instance, complainants will still be required to present his or her case.

(e) Hearings will be closed to the public, without exception. Prospective witnesses, other than the complainant and respondent, shall be excluded from the hearing during the testimony of other witnesses. All parties and witnesses shall be excluded from Panel deliberations. Both the complainant and the respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. The role of these advisors shall be limited to consultation. Under no circumstances are advisors permitted to address the Panel or question witnesses. If the respondent's advisor is a lawyer, the University may have legal counsel present.

(f) Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the investigatory model of administrative hearings, in which the Hearing Panel assumes responsibility for the questioning of witnesses and the eliciting of relevant evidence. The purpose of the hearing is to establish the facts. The burden of proof shall be upon the complainant, who must establish the guilt of the respondent by a preponderance of the evidence. "Preponderance of the evidence" is that evidence, which when fairly considered, produces the stronger impression, has the greater weight, and is more

convincing as to its truth when weighed against the evidence offered in opposition.

(g) Formal rules of evidence shall not be applicable in proceedings conducted pursuant to this Code. The presiding officer shall admit all matters into evidence that reasonable persons would accept as having probative value. Panel members may take into consideration matters that would be within the general experience of University students and faculty members.

(h) The presiding officer shall exercise control over the proceedings to achieve orderly and timely completion of the hearing. Any person, including the complainant and respondent, who disrupts a hearing may be excluded by the presiding officer. The presiding officer shall direct the hearing through the following: statements from both the complainant and respondent, questioning and cross-examination of witnesses by both the complainant and respondent, the questioning of the complainant, respondent and any witnesses by panel members, and concluding statements by the complainant and respondent.

(i) Hearings shall be tape-recorded. These tapes will be retained for a period of three years.

(j) Any party may challenge a panel member on the grounds of personal bias. In such cases, panel members may be disqualified from the hearing by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate, or upon majority vote of the remaining members of the Panel, conducted by secret ballot.

(k) Witnesses shall be asked to affirm that their testimony is truthful. False testimony will be subject to charges of intentionally providing false information to the University, pursuant to Part 11(f) of the Code of Conduct.

(l) Affidavits shall only be admitted into evidence if signed by the affiant and witnessed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate.

Section 7 - Appeals

Appeals of the decision of the Hearing Panel or of the sanction imposed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall only be based on new evidence or evidence of bias. [Appeals will be reviewed by the President of the University.] After a decision has been confirmed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, either party may file, within three working days, an intention to appeal with the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. A petition of appeal must be filed within five working days of the declaration of intention. Appeals will be reviewed by the President of the University. The President will then make a decision on the appeal, based on the petition and the reports of the Hearing Panel and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**Article IV - Amendments to the Honor Code**

Section 1 - Amendments

(a) Amendments to the Honor Code shall be referred to or initiated by the either the Faculty Senate or the Student Association. In order for an amendment to pass, both must approve the measure with a simple majority vote.

(b) Amendments will then be forwarded to the President of the University for confirmation and submission to the Board of Trustees.

Section 2 - Reports and Reviews

(a) The Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make an annual report to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee, the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee, and the Council of Deans on the work of the Honor Council.

(b) The Honor Council may, from time to time, make reports and recommendations to the Faculty Senate, the Student Association Senate or the Joint Committee of Faculty and

Students about the state of the Honor Code.

(c) The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students shall conduct a review of the Honor Code within five years of its implementation.

**Article V - Implementation**

Section 1 - Mission of the Implementation Team

(a) The mission of the Implementation Team will be to plan for effective implementation of the Honor Code and to ensure that appropriate, adequate, and timely preparation is completed prior to the date of implementation.

(b) The types of preparation essential to effective implementation include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) developing ways to educate faculty and students about the importance of academic integrity and its impact on the University;
2) publication and distribution of the Code itself;
3) preparation of documents that relate the Code to practical student and faculty experience and that provide both groups with strategies for avoiding academic dishonesty;
4) inclusion of the Honor Code in the recruitment of prospective students and faculty;
5) planning for student, faculty and graduate teaching assistant orientation, guidance and training;
6) working out practical details of implementation not explicitly covered in the Code, such as the organization of the Honor Council, the process for identifying candidates for the Honor Council, and the development of an application for Honor Council members;
7) prepare a fuller listing of potential sanctions, and guidelines about the offenses for which they might be appropriate;
8) planning ways to maintain a high level of visibility for the Code.

Section 2 - Composition of the Implementation Team

(a) The Implementation Team will convened by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, upon adoption of the Honor Code.

(b) The Implementation Team will be comprised of the following members:

1) the Faculty Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students;
2) the Student Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students;
3) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy;
4) the Chair of the Student Association Senate Academic Affairs Committee;
5) the Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or a designate;
6) the President of the Student Association or a designate;
7) the University's General Counsel or a designate;
8) the Dean of the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences or a designate;
9) the Dean of the Elliott School of International Affairs or a designate;
10) the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development or a designate;
11) the Dean of the School of Business and Public Management or a designate;
12) the Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Science or a designate;
13) the Associate Dean of the Health Sciences Program in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences or a designate;
14) the Dean of Students or a designate;
15) any other members of the University the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designate may deem necessary.

# A RESOLUTION ON FINAL EXAMINATION CONFLICTS (94/9)

WHEREAS, The George Washington University wants to optimize students' academic performance; and

WHEREAS, oral tradition intimates that if a student has three final examinations scheduled for the same day, that student is entitled to request that one of the three examinations be rescheduled; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

(1) That there be written regulation affirming ~~students' rights~~ the University policy permitting students to have one final examination rescheduled if they have three or more final examinations scheduled on the same day; and

(2) That the rescheduling take place at least three weeks prior to the last day of classes and that, whenever possible, the make-up examination be rescheduled during the examination period; and

(3) That the rescheduling be achieved in consultation with the instructors involved and that, whenever possible, the student selects which examination to reschedule.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
December 1994

Adopted, as amended, March 10, 1995

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor John Eftis, Chair, Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty, Ext. 4-6536]

A RESOLUTION ON A UNIVERSITY-WIDE POLICY ON NON-SMOKING (94/10)

WHEREAS, federal courts have ruled that regulations which ban smoking in all indoor workplaces are constitutional; and

WHEREAS, it is now generally recognized that ~~cigarette~~ tobacco smoking is hazardous to one's health, and that inhalation of ~~cigarette~~ tobacco smoke is also detrimental to health; and

WHEREAS, a policy for restriction of smoking exists within the University, nevertheless different units of the University, including the Hospital, Medical Center, Law School, University Club, J Street Food Court and the Gelman Library have found it necessary to institute smoking restrictions individually; ~~and~~

~~WHEREAS, The George Washington University recognizes the legal right of those who choose to smoke, in that designated areas for smoking are, or will be made available;~~
NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That ~~it would be desirable to have~~ the University adopt a uniform University-wide policy ~~for~~ on non-smoking whereby ~~with the exception of specially designated smoke areas,~~ smoking in classrooms and in all academic and administrative support facilities, including offices, halls and stairways, shall be prohibited. ~~and that the University Administration shall take appropriate measures to ensure that the policy is implemented.~~

Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
March, 1995

Adopted, as amended, April 14, 1995

**A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION** (94/11)

**WHEREAS,** Stefan O. Schiff will retire in June as Professor Emeritus of Zoology and of Genetics after 31 years of service to The George Washington University; and

**WHEREAS,** Stefan O. Schiff has earned the respect and gratitude of the entire University community; **NOW, THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

That the following citation be issued:

In recognition of his contributions to The George Washington University during 31 years of service to his students and colleagues in the Biological Sciences of the Columbian School of Arts and Sciences; and

In recognition of his dedicated and principled efforts on behalf of academic excellence as Chair of the Biological Sciences Department for 10 years and Director of the Genetics Program for 16 years; and

In recognition of his independence of spirit, integrity, and perserverance in support and defense of the highest principles of the Academy; and

Especially in recognition of his 23 years of conscientious service as a member of the Faculty Senate and, specifically, for his service of 3 years on the Executive Committee, 9 years as Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, 5 years as Co-Chair of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, 5 years as Chair of the Athletics and Recreation Committee, 1 year as Chair of the Student Financial Aid Committee, and 1 year as Chair of the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty;

**THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**CITES**

**PROFESSOR STEFAN O. SCHIFF**

**FOR**

**DISTINGUISHED SERVICE**

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
President

Lilien F. Robinson
Chair, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

April 14, 1995
Adopted by acclamation
April 14, 1995

**A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION** (94/12)

**WHEREAS,** Lilien F. Robinson has earned the deepest respect, eternal gratitude and affection of the University community; and

**WHEREAS,** her term of service on the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has reached its statutory limit; **NOW, THEREFORE**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

That the following citation be issued:

In recognition of her contributions to The George Washington University during 30 years of service to her students, and colleagues as Teaching Fellow, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor of Art History; and

In recognition of her outstanding leadership in her eminent, devoted, and exceptional efforts as Chair of the Department of Art for 17 years; and

In recognition of her dedication to scholarship and high academic standards, and her patience, objectivity, eloquence, diplomacy, warmth and humanity in resolving complex issues on behalf of the University community; and

Especially in recognition of her exemplary and loyal service to the faculty, including 17 years as a member of the Faculty Senate, 7 years of service on the Executive Committee, 5 years as Chair of the Executive Committee, 6 years as Chair of the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies, and 3 years as Chair of the Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty;

**THE FACULTY SENATE**

**OF**

**THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

**CITES**

**PROFESSOR LILIEN F. ROBINSON**

**FOR**

**DISTINGUISHED SERVICE**

Stephen J. Trachtenberg

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg
President

April 14, 1995
Adopted by acclamation
April 14, 1995

[Any inquiries about this resolution should be directed to Professor Walter K. Kahn, Chair, Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Ext. 47186]

A RESOLUTION REGARDING A POLICY ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH (94/13)

WHEREAS, the specific circumstances underlying the urgency for type of Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research document before us now are explicit in the draft regulation of the National Science Fundation, "Investigator Financial Disclosure Policy," now scheduled to become effective June 28, 1995 [See document]; and

WHEREAS, the formulation of a new University-wide policy on conflicts of interest applicable to all University personnel and not limited to the area of research will require additional time and study, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has recommended limiting the implementation of the present conflict of interest policy document to FACULTY and RESEARCHERS engaged in, or submitting applications for, research funded by the National Science Foundation and other federal agencies which might institute similar requirements; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That the Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of the **Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research** as formulated by the Advisory Council on Research and amended by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
April 26, 1995

Resolution adopted, approving the Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research, as further amended by the Faculty Senate April 28, 1995.

ADOPTED, AS AMENDED, BY
THE FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 28, 1995*

Resolution (94/13)

SUBSTITUTE

The George Washington University

# Policy on Conflict of Interest in Federally Funded Research

## Preamble and Declaration of Purpose

Potential conflicts of interest are a universal fact of life; they occur when the fulfillment of an obligation, commitment, or responsibility makes it difficult or impossible to fulfill other obligations, commitments, or responsibilities. They obviously may differ in extent or degree. The goal of any institution cannot be to eliminate all conflicts of interest. Rather it should be to define those conflicts of interest which directly or indirectly involve the institution and to establish boundaries within which conflicts of interest are tolerable and beyond which they are intolerable.

A cornerstone for a statement of policy on conflict of interest involving the University must include the principle that "... faculty shall have a primary responsibility of devoting their time, thought, and energy to service of the University" [Faculty Code III F]. At the same time and of no less importance is a *FACULTY MEMBER's* responsibility to further her/his own professional development and the goals of her/his professional discipline. Under normal circumstances, a *FACULTY MEMBER's* participation in the activities of governmental, industrial, and professional institutions is consistent with the academic interests of the University as well as those of the *FACULTY MEMBER*.

As an important component of its education, research, and public service activities, the University encourages relationships with outside parties in both the private and public sectors. Concurrently, the University strives to recruit and retain individuals with the creative abilities who can contribute to technology transfer and interactions with both the private and public sectors consistent with their primary commitment to the University. The growing partnership between the University and these entities creates new possibilities for conflict of interest. At the same time, the University benefits from research activities supported by grants, contracts, or gifts from both private and public sources, as well as from professional interactions, including consulting arrangements, between faculty and public and private entities. Such activities tend to enhance the research environment of the University in such a way as to raise the student body's general educational experience and potential for employment. Technology transfer, whether in the form of technology licensing, faculty consulting, business assistance, or by other means, and whether connected with the private or public sectors, is essential for meeting the needs of society today. The University is committed to being a full participant in helping society at large meet its needs of today and tomorrow.

*Amendments indicated by double lines

As the University plays such a role in society, constant accountability and amenability to public scrutiny must be present. This requires that the University and its *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* commit themselves to conduct of the highest integrity and ethics. For example, the value of the results from privately or publicly sponsored research must not be compromised by any *FINANCIAL INTEREST* that will, or may be reasonably expected to, bias the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. It is not the intent of this policy to regulate or eliminate all circumstances of conflicts of interest. Rather, the purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to faculty in maintaining a reasonable balance between competing interests, to minimize reporting and other burdens on investigators, and to give the University the means, consistent with Federal requirements, to identify and manage conflicts of interest that could bias research outcomes. The University therefore requires all *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs* engaged in, or submitting applications for, research funded by any Federal entity with financial disclosure requirements for investigators to follow guidelines and procedures as outlined under 'Implementation' of this University Policy on Conflict of Interest; other *FACULTY* and *RESEARCHERs* are not subject to the detailed requirements set forth in the section dealing with 'Implementation'.

## Conflicts of Interest and External Relationships

### A. Definition of Terms

a) *FACULTY MEMBER* means any individual possessing either a full-time or part-time academic appointment at the University as defined in the Faculty Code.

b) *RESEARCHER* means all those individuals, e.g., staff and students, conducting, authorizing expenditures for, or negotiating terms for conducting research through Federal funding and/or associated with and responsible for Federally funded *SPONSORED RESEARCH* at the University.

c) An *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* of a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* means any trust, organization or enterprise other than the University or any affiliated Hospital over which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, alone or together with her/his *FAMILY*, exercises a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*.

d) *BUSINESS* means any corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, firm franchise, association, organization, holding company, joint stock company, receivership, business or real estate trust, or any other non governmental legal entity organized for profit, not-for-profit, or charitable purposes, but excluding the University, any affiliated Hospital, or any other entity controlled by, controlling, or under common control with the University or an affiliated Hospital.

e) *EXECUTIVE POSITION* refers to any position which includes responsibilities for a significant segment of the operation or management of a *BUSINESS*.

f) The *FAMILY* of a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* includes her/his spouse, minor children, or other persons living in the same household, but in particular if living on the same household budget.

g) A *FINANCIAL INTEREST* is an interest in a *BUSINESS* consisting of: (1) any stock, stock option, or similar ownership interest in such *BUSINESS*, but excluding any interest arising solely by reason of investment in such *BUSINESS* by a mutual, pension, or other institutional investment fund over which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* does not exercise control; or (2) receipt of, or the right or expectation to receive, any income from such *BUSINESS*, whether in the form of a fee (e.g., consulting), salary, allowance, forbearance, forgiveness, interest in real or personal property, dividend, royalty derived from the licensing of technology or other processes or products, rent, capital gain, real or personal property, or any other form of compensation, or any combination thereof. For purposes of this policy, a *FINANCIAL INTEREST* exists when the interest in a *BUSINESS* by a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* and/or by a *FAMILY* member exceeds $5,000 in annual income of all types, equity or ownership interest valued at 5%, or $5,000, or more, or commitment for any future royalties. A *FINANCIAL INTEREST* also exists when a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* or a *FAMILY* member holds an *EXECUTIVE POSITION* in a *BUSINESS*.

h) *PARTICIPATE* means to be part of the described activity in any capacity, including but not limited to serving as the principal investigator, co-investigator, research collaborator, or provider of direct services or patient care, as well as overseer of any expenditures. This term is not intended to apply to individuals who provide primarily technical support or who are purely advisory, with no access to the data (i.e., control over its collection or analysis) or, in the case of clinical research, to the trial participants, unless they are in a position to influence the study's results or have privileged information as to the outcome.

i) *SPONSORED RESEARCH* means research, training, and instructional projects involving funds, materials, or other compensation originating from Federal sources under agreements which contain any of the following: The agreement binds the University or an affiliated institution to a line of scholarly or scientific inquiry specified to a substantial level of detail; a line-item budget is involved; financial reports are required; the award is subject to external audit; unexpended funds must be returned to the sponsor at the conclusion of the project; or the agreement provides for the disposition of either tangible or intangible properties that may result from the activity.

## B. Types of Conflicts

***Conflicts of Interest:***

The following material is to serve as descriptive, but not all inclusive, background relating to extramural relationships subject to this policy.

A conflict of interest is deemed to occur when an external or internal relationship directly or indirectly affects the *FINANCIAL INTEREST* of the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, any *FAMILY* member, or any *ASSOCIATED ENTITY*.

The University assumes that the possibility for conflicts of interest will occur on a regular basis owing to the nature and scope of the activities in which *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* normally engage. However, it is essential that potential significant conflicts of interest be disclosed and reviewed by the University. Disclosure permits the University to make an informed judgment about appropriate steps to follow.

Potential conflicts of interest occur when certain behaviors of a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* are coupled to the existence of certain external relationships. As guidance for this policy, examples are given below with a division into three categories: **Category I** -- Allowable combinations of activities and external relationships; **Category II** -- Activities that are ordinarily allowable following disclosure with oversight procedures if necessary; **Category III** -- Activities that may be allowable with oversight after disclosure, review, and approval.

Any combination of activity and external relationships not specifically given in one of the three categories that a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* reasonably might construe as a potential conflict of interest should be reported in writing to her/his department chair, department head, center/institute director, or dean, if the latter is the direct line of responsibility. The department chair or head, center/institute director, or dean will determine whether the relationship represents an activity requiring further review, and will notify the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* accordingly in writing..

**Category I** -- Allowable combinations of activities and external relationships.

a) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* receiving royalties and honoraria for published scholarly works, occasional lectures, speeches, and other writings or creative works.

b) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* receiving honoraria for serving as a reviewer or serving on review panels for academic, governmental, or not-for-profit organizations.

c) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* receiving royalties under the University's or another academic institution's royalty-sharing policies, but the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* does not have any other relationship with the royalty-granting entity. Details on the University's policy can be found in the Patent Policy document.

**Category II** -- Activities that are ordinarily allowable following disclosure with oversight procedures if necessary.

Research Activities:

a) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER PARTICIPATING* in research on a technology, process, or product developed in whole or in part by that *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* from which she/he, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* is entitled to receive royalties from an existing *BUSINESS* under the University's or another academic institution's royalty-sharing policies, but has no other *FINANCIAL INTERESTs* in the project.

b) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* assigning students , postdoctoral fellows, or other trainees to research projects in which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* is entitled to receive royalties from an existing agreement with a *BUSINESS* under the University or another academic institution's royalty-sharing policies, but has no other *FINANCIAL INTERESTs* in the project.

Instructional Projects:

c) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* assigning students, trainees, or other staff to instructional projects, for example, design projects, in which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* has a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*.

**Category III** -- Activities that may be allowable with oversight only after disclosure, review, and approval.

Research Activities:

a) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER PARTICIPATING* in research on a technology owned by or contractually obligated to a *BUSINESS* in which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* has a consulting relationship or holds a *FINANCIAL INTEREST* other than receipt of University or Medical Center *SPONSORED RESEARCH* support or royalties consistent with the University's Patent Policy.

b) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* assigning students, postdoctoral fellows, or other trainees to research projects in which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* has a consulting relationship or holds a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*, other than receipt of University or Medical Center *SPONSORED RESEARCH* support or royalties consistent with the University's Patent Policy.

c) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* receiving University or Medical Center *SPONSORED RESEARCH* support from a *BUSINESS* in which she/he, a member of her/his *FAMILY*, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* holds a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*.

d) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or University *RESEARCHER* conducting research externally that would normally be conducted within the University.

Board Memberships:

e) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* serving on the Board of Directors or Scientific Advisory Board of a *BUSINESS* from which that *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* or a member of her/his *FAMILY* receives University or Medical Center *SPONSORED RESEARCH* support or with which the University has a substantial contractual relationship known to the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER.*

Committee *PARTICIPATION:*

f) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER PARTICIPATING* in the consideration by a governmental agency of a technology which is owned by or contractually obligated to a *BUSINESS* in which that *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a *FAMILY* member, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* has a *FINANCIAL INTEREST.*

External Activities:

g) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* holding an *EXECUTIVE POSITION* in a for-profit *BUSINESS* engaged in commercial or research activities directly related to her/his University responsibilities.

h) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* making clinical or other referrals within the scope of her/his University or Medical Center duties to a *BUSINESS* in which such *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, a *FAMILY* member, or an *ASSOCIATED ENTITY* has a *FINANCIAL INTEREST.*

i) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* possessing a *FINANCIAL INTEREST* in a *BUSINESS* which competes with the services provided by the University or Medical Center with which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* is affiliated.

Public Disclosure:

j) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* publishing or formally presenting research results, or providing expert commentary on a subject without having previously disclosed or simultaneously disclosing any *FINANCIAL INTEREST* relating to such results or such subject.

Administrative Responsibilities:

k) A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* taking administrative action within the University or Medical Center which is beneficial to a *BUSINESS* in which she/he has a *FINANCIAL INTEREST.*

***Internal University Conflicts:***

Though the examples given above describe conflicts a *FACULTY MEMBER* may voluntarily face, the administration of the University must be cognizant of and ready to resolve conflicts that may arise due to pressures from within the University. *FACULTY* are expected to disclose such conflicts. Three examples follow:

a) A *FACULTY MEMBER* who has summer research support might inadvertently be asked by her/his Department Chair to devote substantial time to non research activities, e.g., curriculum revision, and still be expected to sign a declaration, e.g., a government form, that 100% of her/his time was spent on the research project.

b) In its effort to increase the financial return of the institution, the University might encourage the pursuit of activities that will generate income from service-oriented contracts at the expense of freely chosen disinterested research and scholarship.

c) The University might seek to restrict a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* from publishing or formally presenting research results, or providing expert commentary on a subject, because of a University *FINANCIAL INTEREST* relating to such results or such subject.

## Implementation

Successful implementation of this policy assumes a shared responsibility by all *FACULTY MEMBERs, RESEARCHERs,* and the administration of the University. *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs* are expected to report and to seek guidance concerning significant potential conflicts of interest in order to ensure that the interests of the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, her/his profession, and the University are best served. To aid individuals in this process, a set of disclosure guidelines are given below. Once proposed activities have been administratively reviewed, including a plan of action developed and approved, University administration has the responsibility to defend the activity so long as the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* follows the plan of action, the disclosure guidelines, general University policies, and the law.

### A. Disclosure Guidelines

Disclosure of *FINANCIAL INTERESTs*: Anytime a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* plans to initiate an activity that falls under **Categories II or III** of this policy, the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* is expected to disclose the activity in accordance with Part **B.** of this implementation section and, when required, to obtain written approval prior to beginning the activity. For purposes of this policy, disclosure is required when that interest in a *BUSINESS* by a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, or by a *FAMILY* member, exceeds $5,000 in annual income of all types, equity or

ownership interest valued at 5%, or $5,000, or more, or commitment for any future royalties. Disclosure is also required when a *FAMILY* member holds an *EXECUTIVE POSITION* in a *BUSINESS*.

Disclosure when submitting a proposal for *SPONSORED RESEARCH*: All *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* must disclose relevant *FINANCIAL INTERESTs* on the Investigator "Significant Financial Interest Disclosure" form (Appendix A) at the time of their application for research support or technology transfer. Funding for the project will not be accessible to the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* until the disclosure of *FINANCIAL INTEREST* is reviewed and approval is given, and other appropriate measures have been implemented in accord with this policy.

Disclosure when involved with review or advisory activities: All *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* are expected to temporarily excuse themselves from any University committee or review process that is considering an activity in which they have a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*.

Disclosure when involved with technology transfer: When *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* are involved with transferring technology through patents or licensing to a *BUSINESS* in which the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* has a *FINANCIAL INTEREST*, the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* is expected to disclose the *FINANCIAL INTEREST* to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

Disclosure to external entities: *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* are expected to disclose relevant *FINANCIAL INTERESTs* to sponsors of research and in reporting, by either written or oral communication, research results.

**B. Process**

It is assumed that minor conflicts shall be resolved primarily through individual discretion or informal administrative adjustment. If a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* is engaged or expects to become engaged in an activity that might lead to a conflict of commitment or interest, she/he is expected to consult with appropriate administrative officers, i.e., the Department Chair or Head, or equivalent, and (if necessary) the Dean or Dean's designate. In addition, a Conflicts Consultation Committee shall be established in order to afford administrators and *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* the opportunity of consultation and, in the event of a disagreement, peer review. It shall be the responsibility of the affected parties to handle questions (whether consultative or probative) in a timely and confidential manner.

### *I. Establishment of the Conflicts Consultation Committee*

A Conflicts Consultation Committee of at least five members shall be established within each School of the University. Its members shall be broadly representative of the disciplines and units within the School, and shall be elected by the faculty of each School.

### *II. Functions of the Conflicts Consultation Committee*

The Committee shall have both a consultative (prospective) function and a probative (reactive) function:

a) Consultative: Consultative matters -- defined here as guidance on questions regarding whether a prospective activity may be in violation of this policy -- may be brought to the committee in two primary ways. First, consultation normally shall begin through administrative channels and may be referred by the Dean to the committee for its advice. Second, a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* may seek the advice of the Committee if administrative consultation ends in disagreement.

In either case, whenever the Committee finds that no conflict or potential for conflict exists in a prospective activity, the Committee shall keep a written record of its consultative activity and shall inform the appropriate parties in writing, including the Dean.

Whenever consultation results in the recommendation that a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* refrain from the activity on which consultation was sought, the committee shall report in writing that finding to the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* involved, to the appropriate administrative officers, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Whenever a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* or Dean disagrees with the Committee's consultative advice, she/he may appeal the Committee's advisory decision to the University Panel (see Section III, below).

In addition, *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* may consult confidentially and informally with the Committee; however, such consultations shall be considered advisory only and non binding.

b) Probative: Probative matters -- defined here as questioning whether on-going or completed activity may be in violation of this policy -- may be brought to the Committee in either of two ways. First, any disagreement regarding a probative matter that arises between the Dean and a *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER*, regardless of who initiated the question, may be referred to the Committee for review. Second, any member of the University community may bring directly to the Committee's attention a probative matter alleged to be in violation of this policy. A *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* whose activity has been questioned shall be entitled to know the identity of the person(s) bringing such a question(s) to the Committee as well as the full extent of the question(s).

Although the Committee shall have no power to affix blame, assign penalties, or require action, it may inquire in writing of *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* whose activities have been questioned and the *FACULTY MEMBERs* or *RESEARCHERs* in turn have the responsibility to respond to the inquiry.

Upon investigation, the Committee shall make a written report to the Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs either of whom, in turn, may refer the matter to the University Conflicts Resolution Panel (see below). Copies of this report shall be given to the individual who raised the question before the Committee, and to the *FACULTY MEMBER OR RESEARCHER* whose activities have been questioned. The report shall state the nature of the complaint and the results of the Committee inquiry.

### *III. Establishment of a University Conflicts Resolution Panel*

A University Conflicts Resolution Panel shall be constituted of two members from each School's Conflicts Consultation Committee, appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Deans of each School. Members from the School originating a matter shall recuse themselves.

### *IV. Functions of the University Conflicts Resolution Panel*

The Panel shall have both an appeals and a recommending function:

a) The Panel shall hear appeals submitted in writing, containing such detail and accompanied by such supporting materials as the Panel shall reasonably require,

--from any *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* who sought guidance from a School Committee and is dissatisfied with its advice;

--from any *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* whose activities were investigated by a School Committee and is dissatisfied with the result stated in the Committee's report;

--from the Dean or any member of the University community who raised a question of conflict before a School Committee and is dissatisfied with the result stated in the Committee's report; or

--at the request of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in any of the foregoing instances.

b) The Panel shall make recommendations under the following guidelines:

--The University Panel shall give due deference to the report of the Conflicts Consultation Committee and may affirm the recommendation(s) contained in that report.

--The Panel may, if appropriate, consult with third parties.

--The Panel shall render a report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that contains the agreed upon resolution of the matter, or conveys the lack of agreement between the Panel and the individual whose actions or proposed actions are brought into question.

--The Panel shall recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs any further action it deems necessary or appropriate.

### *V. Resolution of Conflicts of Interest*

Decisions on the resolution of conflict-of-interest matters then rest with the Vice President for Academic Affairs after receipt by her/him of the University Conflicts Resolution Panel's report.

## C. Record Retention

The Office of Sponsored Research and the Medical Center Office of Sponsored Projects will maintain records of all financial disclosure forms filed and all actions taken by the University, on an award-by-award basis, for at least three years beyond the termination of the award or until resolution of any action by the University or governmental agencies involving the records. All records will be maintained in a manner to protect confidentiality. Each Dean will maintain the records relating to all disclosures originating from her/his School for at least three years.

## D. Reporting of Previously Approved Relationships

Each Dean annually will submit a written report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs summarizing all requests and actions regarding **Category II** and **Category III** external relationships. In addition, each Dean must report on ongoing **Category II** and **Category III** relationships to ensure that management and oversight activities are being carried out as required. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will forward these reports to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies who may convene a small subcommittee of the Advisory Council on Research to review the activities for consistency. On behalf of the subcommittee, the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies will communicate to the Vice President for Academic Affairs its recommendations in writing, who will in turn communicate in writing with the Deans as required. The Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies will consult with appropriate faculty governance committees regarding proposed changes in the operating principles and procedures.

## E. Compliance

The University expects its *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs* to comply fully and promptly with the policy, including the requirements of disclosure. Instances of

deliberate breach of this policy, including failure to file or knowingly filing an incomplete, erroneous, or misleading disclosure form, violations of guidelines, or failure to comply with proscribed monitoring procedures, will be adjudicated in accordance with applicable disciplinary policies and procedures of the Medical Center and the University. Sanctions against a faculty member may be imposed only consistent with the Faculty Code of the George Washington University and the Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code. Possible sanctions might include the following:

- Letter of admonition;
- Ineligibility of the *FACULTY MEMBER* or *RESEARCHER* for grant applications, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, or supervision of graduate students;
- Nonrenewal of appointment;
- Dismissal.

**F. Existing Relationships**

As this policy constitutes a new policy for *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs*, it is expected that there exist relationships that may need to be modified. Consequently, in order to implement the policy, *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs* must disclose all existing external relationships that fall under **Categories II and III** above to their Department Chair or equivalent for review. This provision also applies to all new *FACULTY MEMBERs* and *RESEARCHERs* hired after this policy is adopted.

Acknowledgments and Background: This policy on conflict of interest is predominantly modeled after those of Harvard Medical School and the University of Minnesota which parallel each other closely both in format and wording. In some sections, the wording of the present document is identical or very closely paraphrased to that of Harvard's and Minnesota's. Overall, the drafting of the document was aided by knowledge of the content of similar policies from Auburn University, Penn State University, and Vanderbilt University. Our aim has been to retain as much of the original GW Faculty Senate endorsed Conflict of Interest Policy of January 19, 1990, consistent with the new Federal requirements mandated by the National Science Foundation Financial Disclosure Policy (effective date 28 June 1995), the Public Health Service proposal (expected to be finalized early this year [1995]), and those of the Federal Food and Drug Administration which are forthcoming. Parts of the Implementation section derive from those already passed by the individual Schools, but which have never been implemented.

# Investigator Significant Financial Interest Disclosure Policy

(Applicable to Federally Funded Sponsored Project Proposals)

## What is required?

Federal regulations require institutions to have policies and procedures in place that ensure that investigators disclose any significant financial interest that may present an actual or potential conflict of interest in relationship to externally sponsored projects. Such disclosures must be made **prior to the submission of a proposal** for funding,* and institutions must develop specific mechanisms by which conflicts of interest will be satisfactorily managed, reduced, or eliminated prior to award or acceptance of an award.

* If a new reportable significant conflict of interest arises at any time during the period after the submission of the proposal through the period of the award, the filing of a disclosure is also required.

## Who is covered?

"Investigator" means the principal investigator/project director, co-principal investigators, and any other person at the University who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research or educational activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor. In this context, the term Investigator includes the "Investigator's" spouse and dependent children.

## What must be disclosed?

Each Investigator shall disclose all *significant financial interests*:

(i) that would reasonably appear to be directly and significantly affected by the research or educational activities funded, or proposed for funding, by an external sponsor; or

(ii) in entities whose financial interests would reasonably appear to be directly and significantly affected by such activities.

## What is covered?

**"Significant financial interests"** means anything of monetary value, including, but not limited to, salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria); equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options or other ownership interests); and intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights and royalties from such rights). The term **does not include:**

(1) Salary, royalties, or other remuneration from Institution;

(2) Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by public or nonprofit entities;

(3) Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for public or non profit entities;

(4) Financial interests in business enterprises or entities if the value of such interests does not exceed $5,000 (or $5,000 per annum if such interests represent salary, fees or other continuing payments) or represent more than 5% ownership interest for any one enterprise or entity when aggregated for the investigator and the investigator's spouse and dependent children.

## Disclosure Procedures:

(1) All investigators must disclose their significant financial interests utilizing this form and attaching all required supporting documentation. The completed form and packet must be submitted with the proposal and Institution's Standard Routing Sheet to the appropriate Office of Sponsored Programs. Supporting documentation should be submitted in a sealed envelope marked *confidential.*

(2) In accordance with Federal regulations, a complete disclosure must be made by Investigator(s) *prior to submission of the proposal.*

(3) Resolutions to conflicts of interest will be incorporated in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that is executed between the Investigator(s) and the Dean/Director prior to award or award acceptance.

## Significant Financial Interest Disclosure

(Applicable to Federally Funded Sponsored Project Proposals)

**Faculty/Staff Name** _____

**Department/Unit** _____

**College/Unit** _____

**Proposal Submitted to** _____

**I am disclosing the following significant financial interests (check one) and attaching supporting documentation (in an envelope marked confidential) that identifies the business enterprise or entity involved and the nature and amount of the interest:**

("Significant financial interests" are defined on page 1.)

____ Salary or other payment for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria).

____ Equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options, or other ownership interests).

____ Intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights).

____ Other significant financial interest of the Investigator that possibly could affect or be perceived to affect the results of the research or educational activities funded or proposed for funding.

**I have no significant financial interests to disclose:** _____
**Initials**

**Further I agree:**

* To update this disclosure during the pendency of the award, either on an annual basis, or as new reportable significant financial interests are obtained.
* To cooperate in the development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that constitutes a conflict of interest "resolution plan."
* To comply with any conditions or restrictions imposed by the University to manage, reduce, or eliminate actual or potential conflicts of interest or forfeit the award.

**Signed:** _____ **Date:** _____

(Original signature only—a "per" signature is not acceptable.)

**Endorsements:**

**I have reviewed the significant financial interest disclosure and believe that it will be possible to develop and execute, prior to award, an MOU to manage, reduce, or eliminate any actual or potential conflict of interest; and, therefore, I recommend that the proposal be submitted to the agency at this time.**

**Department/Unit Head:** _____ _____
Signed Date

**College Dean/Director:** _____ _____
Signed Date